

122

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o XIII. OCTOBER 1878.

ART. I.—FURTHER EVIDENCE ON THE
PETRINE CLAIMS.

1. *Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese of Westminster.* By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. (London, 1871.)
2. *The See of S. Peter.* By T. W. ALLIES. (London, 1850.)
3. *The Evidence for the Papacy, as derived from the Holy Scriptures and from Primitive Antiquity.* By the Hon. COLIN LINDSAY. (London, 1870.)
4. *The Privilege of Peter and the Claims of the Roman Church confronted with the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Testimony of the Popes themselves.* By ROBERT C. JENKINS, M.A. (London, 1875.)

IN a previous number of this *Review* we sifted the Scriptural evidence for the 'Privilege of Peter,' and compared it with the rules laid down by the Canon Law of the Roman Church for the attestation of all claims of this particular kind. The claim we then discussed was that raised on behalf of S. Peter, and of the Popes regarded as his successors; a claim altogether distinct from the question of any primacy inherent in the See and City of Rome, of which the 'Popes' are Bishops. It is time now to enter on this next branch of the inquiry, and to ascertain whether Scripture yields any more satisfactory proof on behalf of the See, as distinguished from the Pope, of Rome. This done, the Scriptural argument will be closed, and it will then remain to inquire finally whether the other evidence producible, apart from Scripture, is of such a kind as to create a reasonable presumption in favour

VOL. VII.—NO. XIII.

B

370610

of the Divine, or at least Apostolical, character of Papal supremacy, analogous to that which exists for infant baptism, the tenet of Eucharistic sacrifice, or for Sunday observance.

We will therefore first discuss that part of the Papal claims (also adduced as resting on express Divine revelation) which alleges the indefeasible primacy of the city and see of Rome, asserted to be so indissolubly bound up with the Petrine privilege that even to suggest that the Chief Patriarch of the Christian Church might have his see transferred to some other city, say Jerusalem, in time to come, is to incur the Vatican anathemas. If this be so, we shall certainly find clear analogical preparation for it in the Old Testament, and evident development of the idea in the New.

At first, then, there appears no centre of worship whatever. The altar depends for its locality on the casual halt of the nomad Patriarchs (Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 18; xxi. 33); and the earliest intimation of a more settled shrine is found in Jacob's vow at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 16-22). During the Exodus the Tabernacle was the travelling 'field-chapel' of the Israelite host (Numb. ii. 17; x. 17, 21). But in the book of Deuteronomy repeatedly occurs a declaration that a national centre of worship would be set up in Canaan, where only the rites of sacrifice could be lawfully and acceptably performed. One citation will suffice:—

'But when ye go over Jordan, and dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when He giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety; then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause His Name to dwell there; thither shall ye bring all that I command you; your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave offering of your hand, and all your choice vows which ye vow unto the Lord.'—Deut. xii. 10, 11.

For a considerable time, however, this central shrine was not absolutely fixed and permanent. Shiloh, its first seat (Josh. xviii. 1), remained such from the time of Joshua till the Philistine capture of the Ark (1 Sam. iv. 4, 11), which was restored to Kirjath-Jearim (1 Sam. vii. 1, 2), whence, after a long interval, David translated it to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi. 2, 12), its final seat. With the building of Solomon's temple begins the great series of Divine promises of permanence for this great national shrine, conditioned from the very first, however, with possibilities of forfeiture (1 Kings ix. 1-9). To this sacred place the strict theory of the Law, albeit necessarily relaxed by dispensations, enjoined every adult male of the Hebrew nation to make pilgrimages thrice every year:—

'Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles: and they shall not appear before the Lord empty.'—Deut. xvi. 16.

And as a practical fact, even when the nation, in the post-exilic period, had long ceased to be included within the borders of Palestine, one visit, at least, in a lifetime was as much the desire of every devout Jew as the pilgrimage to Mecca is of the fervent Moslem in our own day.

What is especially noticeable about the series of prophecies concerning Jerusalem, both before and after its overthrow by the Chaldeans, is that its restoration to more than its former glory is always foretold in explicit terms. And after deducting all the passages of this kind, which may fairly be explained in the literal sense by the rebuilding under Ezra and Nehemiah, or in the spiritual order by the manifestation of Christ at Jerusalem, and the origin of the Gospel thence as its local source, such as

'And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.'—Is. ii. 2, 3,

there remains a residuum not capable of being so treated, in which indefeasible supremacy appears to be promised. Here are a few examples:—

'Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken.'—Is. xxxiii. 20.

'And the sons of strangers shall build thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in My wrath I smote thee, but in My favour have I had mercy on thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted. The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir tree, the pine tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of My sanctuary; and I will make the place of My feet glorious. The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and

they shall call thee, The city of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel. Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations.'—Is. lx. 10-15.

'And I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the Lord shall reign over them in mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem.'—Micah iv. 7, 8.

'And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. And it shall be, that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain.'—Zech. xiv. 16, 17.

There are only four possible ways of explaining these statements:—(a) They are not inspired prophecies at all, but the mere fervent wishes and guesses of Hebrew enthusiasts; (b) their fulfilment is yet future, and points to the restoration of Jerusalem as the central shrine of the world; (c) they are conditional, albeit the condition is not verbally expressed, and their promises have been forfeited by Jewish unbelief; (d) they are typical of another and holier Jerusalem. The Roman controversialist is estopped from accepting either (a) or (b). If he accept (c), he destroys the argument for the indefeasibility of the similar position claimed for Rome, and he is thus practically limited to (d), and is bound to show that Rome, by reasonable implication, if not by necessary consequence, fulfils the needful conditions as the antitype of this Old Testament type.

What evidence does the New Testament yield on this head?

a. There is absolutely but one passage in the Gospels which can be said to bear on the inquiry, since our Lord's mention of Jerusalem as 'the city of the Great King' (S. Matt. v. 35) does not decide it. That passage is the speech of Christ to the Samaritan woman at the well of Sychar:—

'The woman saith unto Him, Sir, I perceive that Thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the

Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.'—S. John iv. 19-24.

The only interpretation of this passage which will fairly stand is that it points to the decentralisation and delocalisation of worship under the Gospel, in direct contrast to the usage under the Law. And, as a fact, such decentralisation has actually taken place. It is one of the chief boasts of the Roman Church that no minute of any day from year to year passes during which the highest rite of Christian worship is not being actually celebrated, in one part or other of the world, by her priests; and a popular lithograph print, to be procured in Parisian shops for *objets de religion*, is the 'Dial of the Eucharist,' showing at what place Mass is being said as each hour comes round at the meridian of Paris, whether it be Edinburgh, Vienna, Moscow, Damascus, Calcutta, Peking, Melbourne, San Francisco, Buenos Ayres, or Capetown.

Hence, the chief motive for the peculiar regard paid to Jerusalem no longer exists, for the political accident of its being the capital of the Davidic line of kings had nothing to do with its religious sacredness as the one place of lawful sacrifice. To retain another city in a similar position, when all monopoly of this peculiar kind has been abolished for nearly two thousand years, would have no adequate motive whatever.

6. Next, what does the letter of the New Testament tell us about Rome? Is there anything which foretells its coming dignity, or its relation to S. Peter? No syllable in the Old Testament supplies so much as a hint on the subject. While there are many prophecies implying that a Gentile *nation* will succeed to, or partake the privileges of, *Israel*, there is none to suggest that any Gentile *city* shall ever supplant *Jerusalem*. Rome is named exactly nine times in the New Testament, as under:—

1. 'Strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes' (included amongst the concourse on the day of Pentecost).—Acts ii. 10.

2. 'Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome.'—Acts xviii. 2, 3.

3. 'After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome.'—Acts xix. 21.

4. 'And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of Me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.'—Acts xxiii. 11.

5. 'We came the next day to Puteoli: where we found brethren;

and were desired to tarry with them seven days: and so we went toward Rome.'—Acts xxviii. 13, 14.

6. 'And when we came to Rome, the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard: but Paul was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him.'—Acts xxviii. 16.

7. 'To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.'—Rom. i. 7.

8. 'I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also.'—Rom. i. 14, 15.

9. 'The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain: but, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me.'—2 Tim. i. 16, 17.

Now seven of these nine passages are exclusively concerned with some relation of S. Paul, not S. Peter, to Rome; and next, of the other two, one is merely intended to explain the presence of Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth, instead of their being at home in Italy; while the remaining one alone, itself the first cited, has any connexion, even indirectly, with S. Peter, and then no more than is equally shared by Cappadocia, Pontus, Egypt, Libya, and the rest of the catalogue. Not one of them so much as hints at any spiritual pre-eminence, actual or future, attaching to Rome.

And it would be difficult to find a more remarkable contrast than this brief, meagre, cold, and matter-of-fact way in which the imperial mistress of the world is thus casually referred to in Scripture, as compared with the lavish terms of admiration, love, and reverence with which the Prophets greet Jerusalem, nay, even with their recognition of the material splendour and might of Nineveh and Babylon. Not only do the Apostles pass its secular marvels over in utter silence, but no hint of its future spiritual glories escapes from them.

Is there, then, anything lacking? Does Jerusalem alone of the great Old Testament types find no antitype under the Gospel? Certainly she does find one, only, as before, the analogy of faith holds good, and the type is eclipsed utterly by the antitype, belonging as it does to the higher spiritual order. Rome, the centre and strength of the carnal world-power, the last stronghold of classical heathenism, where even in the days of S. Leo the Great, in the very middle of the fifth century, professed Christians (the great Pope tells us in his seventh Christmas Sermon), when actually climbing the ascent up to the high altar of S. Peter's own Basilica, used

to turn round on the steps and solemnly bow down in worship of the Sun God ; Rome, the last powerful enemy of the Cross, would, if put in the stead of Jerusalem, have been in one sense a greater declension than Peter put as the Rock instead of God ; for Peter was, at any rate, a glorious saint, but all Rome's spiritual memories were of idolatry, cruelty, and lust, contrasting with the glory of Jerusalem not merely in the far distant past, but as the City in which the Great King manifested his countenance, fulfilled His work, and endowed His Church with the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

No such degradation from the loftier ideal is to be found. 'Here,' says the Apostle, 'we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come.'—Heb. xiii. 14. And what that is, let him tell us more at length :—

'But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.'—Heb. xii. 22.

It is this 'Jerusalem above [which] is free,' according to S. Paul, 'which is the mother of us all'—Gal. iv. 26 : the only 'mother and mistress of all Churches' known to him. And only to this city are men under the Gospel to go on pilgrimage, because—

'Now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly : wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God : for He hath prepared for them a city.'—Heb. xi. 16.

What it is like S. John tells us in the glowing language at the close of the Apocalypse, wherein the jasper walls, jewelled foundations, gates of pearl, and golden streets of the Heavenly City are depicted.

Such is all that is directly obtainable from the clear letter of Scripture.

There is one isolated fragment of testimony adducible, and adduced, on the Ultramontane side, namely, this verse of the first Epistle of S. Peter :—

'The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you ; and so doth Marcus my son.—1 S. Peter v. 13.

The received opinion in the Roman Church, based on very early tradition (beginning with S. Papias of Hierapolis and, as Eusebius says, S. Clement), and also on arguments

which have some weight and cogency, is that Babylon here stands for Rome. On the whole, there is much to be said for this view, and against the alternatives of the Mesopotamian Babylon and of Cairo, which have been suggested (and, in the former instance, supported with very cogent arguments) by Protestant controversialists (though at best there is only conjecture, not proof), while the Sinaitic MS. supplies the word 'church,' formerly supposed to be missing in the Greek, and thus refutes the theory of Calvin that S. Peter is speaking in this verse, not of the Church, but of his wife, as '*she* who is elect at Babylon.' But the passage, nevertheless, cannot be pleaded in evidence of privilege, because (1) it is unquestionably obscure and ambiguous, not clear and manifest; because (2) it does not specify any *official* connexion between S. Peter and the Church at Babylon, wherever that may have been; and because, (3) even if these two facts were otherwise, the adjective 'elect together,' *συνεκλεκτή*, Vulg. *coelecta*, denotes absolute equality of spiritual condition with those other Churches of 'Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,' enumerated in the opening words of this Epistle as those to which it is addressed. And, lastly (4), it is the evil case of Babylon that, whether in the Old Testament or the New, there is not one word ever spoken in its favour. Egypt and Assyria, often condemned, have, at any rate, some sets-off to show, as Isaiah xix. 18-24; Ps. lxxviii. 31; Micah vii. 12; but for Babylon, from Isaiah to Revelation, there is nothing but denunciations of judgment, destruction, and woe: no hint of so much as a remnant to be delivered out of it, save of such as, being mere exiles and captives there, are not of its citizens (Rev. xviii. 4, *cf.* Isa. xlviii. 20, Jer. li. 6, 45); no promise of a spiritual growth to spring up when the earthly one is cut down. And therefore, if the types of the Old and New Testament are to count for anything in the evidence, this identification of Babylon and Rome is fatal to any claim of privilege urged on behalf of the latter on the ground of Divine favour and revelation.

The last item of the evidence is that, in the closing book of the Sacred Canon, there is total silence as to any central court of appeal for the Seven Churches, any supreme visible authority to which each Angel is subject. The visitation, so to speak, of each Church is made directly by Christ Himself, and not by any Vicar of His upon earth; and even the Apostle S. John acts as merely communicating a message, not as personally enforcing it.

No case, therefore, can be established from the Holy

Scriptures, regarded in the legal point of view as a single document proffered in evidence of the Petrine privilege, and as the chief item of that evidence, since being the most authoritative and indisputable form of Divine revelation; and therefore unless it can be conclusively shown that this *prima facie* failure to prove the claim thereby is fully repaired by evidence of equivalent weight, as marked in its broader outlines, and as cumulative in its minor indications, as that which has been marshalled above, it remains that Christ as the Rock, and the Heavenly Jerusalem as the Mother of all the Churches, are alone set forth and recognised in these capacities by the inspired writers of the New Testament. And that because the one possible plea in bar of judgment which might be adduced under other circumstances, that of Development, is inapplicable here, first, because a 'charter of privilege' cannot be developed at all, but must have been clearly granted from the first in explicit terms, unlike a mere right by prescription, which may grow through user in course of time; and next, because in this particular instance the comparison of the evidence shows that there is nothing to develop.

So far, then, as the Papal claim is alleged to be of Divine privilege, given by revelation, the Scriptures, treated as the chief document in evidence of claim, fail to satisfy the requirements of Roman Canon Law; for (1) they afford no testimony whatever as to the annexation of privilege to the Roman See, or its transmission from S. Peter to any of his successors; (2) the evidence as to his own primacy is obscurely and enigmatically worded; (3) so far as its wording does go, it is a personal, not an official grant, and thus dies with the original grantee; (4) if continued in the Ultramontane sense, it encroaches on S. Paul's privileges, which are more clearly worded.

Wherever the proof may be found, therefore, it is certainly not in the Scriptures.

Although the investigation of the letter of Scripture yields such extremely slender results in favour of the privilege of Peter, yet it may be, and in fact is, argued that there is such a body of other incontestable evidence on its behalf in existence, proving its recognition and acceptance from the very first, as to amount to proof of Divine revelation; on the principle that the universal prevalence of a certain interpretation of Scripture at the hands of the body which is the custodian and witness of Scripture, and of an unbroken practice based on that interpretation, is as truly proof of its

being revealed as part of the Gospel of Christ as any statement found in the express words of Scripture itself. Exactly so, there are certain statutes in English law whose wording is far from being clear to the lay mind, and whose clauses seem to go but a very small way towards covering the whole subject-matter concerned, but where a perfectly consistent series of decisions in the law-courts, dating from the original enactment, and an unbroken usage in entire harmony therewith, serve as proof to every one that these Acts have in fact one unquestioned meaning, itself as much part of the law of the land as if verbally embodied in their wording.

Examples of the kind referred to may be found in ecclesiastical matters also. The observance of Sunday, the baptism of infants, the institution of episcopacy, do not rest on clear and express warrant of the letter of Scripture. They are instances of an universal identity of interpretation of that letter, resulting in an universal identity of practice all over the Christian world from its earliest times.

And to all who accept the Church as being a divinely established and guided body, such evidence is sufficient; while even those who regard it merely as a human organisation, are constrained to admit that whatever exhibits such complete unison and such an unbroken prescription, must fairly represent the mind of the first Christian teachers, and be clothed with whatever authority they possessed.

If, then, any such harmonious testimony to the Privilege of Peter be producible as that which can be found for Sunday, for infant baptism, and for episcopacy, with a like absence of rebutting evidence, it will, to say the least, very nearly counterbalance the adverse construction which a comparative survey of the bare letter of Scripture forces on the theologian's attention.

'Very nearly,' but not quite. And only 'very nearly,' for these reasons: (1.) The claim in this individual instance is of a special *privilege* by a deed, so to say, of particular grant or donation, to which impugnors are referred as the paramount evidence and authority. The claim on behalf of Sunday observance, or of infant baptism, does not rest on any such definite warrant at all, but on unbroken *prescription*. Now, it is a maxim of Canon Law that *privilege* and *prescription* cannot be simultaneously pleaded on behalf of the same claim; for the man who bases his demand on a deed of privilege is held to renounce his right of prescription—(*Decret. Greg. IX.*, lib. ii. tit. xxvi. and xxvii. 19.) (2.) That which expresses the mind of the Church only, and is not directly

matter of Divine revelation, may be conceivably altered by the consent of the whole body, as if, suppose, the distinction between Metropolitans and Bishops were abolished. But it is not competent for even the whole body to alter, either by enlargement or diminution, whatever it acknowledges to be divinely revealed, as is the case with the books of the Old and New Testament.

The most, therefore, which could be derived from such a consensus of authorities, each indefinitely inferior in weight to any New Testament writer, and all collectively not nearly equalling the aggregate witness of the New Testament, would be a very strong presumption, but still far short of Divine certainty, in favour of a particular opinion or usage, unless this consensus went the whole length of asserting that the matter alleged is a divinely revealed dogma of Christianity. And this is the least which would make amends for the indirectness and obscurity, to say no more, of the evidence for the Privilege of Peter as found in the Scriptures.

Before beginning the investigation of such evidence as is tendered or producible, it is expedient to set down once more the links which must be, one and all of them, conclusively established before the claim will bear the weight of Papal supremacy or infallibility, and also to state the sources of inquiry, and the classification of testimony.

First, then, it must be shown that there is full agreement amongst the Fathers, that S. Peter was the Rock of the Church, was infallible, and was invested with direct jurisdiction over all the other Apostles, and not with a mere primacy of honour.

Next, that this supreme jurisdiction and infallible character were not personal only, but capable of being devolved or transmitted to his successors.

Thirdly, that S. Peter was local and diocesan Bishop of Rome.

Fourthly, that as a matter of fact he did professedly and expressly transmit his privilege to the Bishops of Rome, constituting them his heirs and successors.

Fifthly, that the Christian Church did, in fact, from the earliest times, recognise and submit to this infallible supremacy as of Divine institution.

There are several collateral issues, scarcely less important, but it will suffice to examine these five links, the failure of any one of which is fatal to the whole claim.

As to the sources of inquiry, they are: (1.) The ancient Liturgies. (2.) The writings of the Fathers from S. Ignatius

and other sub-Apostolic authors down to Venerable Bede, A.D. 735. (3.) The canons, decrees, and acts of Councils, and, mainly, the six undisputed General Councils. (4.) The admissions and acts of Popes and others. (5.) All such events in Church history as illustrate the meaning of phrases used by the Fathers.

As to the classification of testimony, nothing that does not help to prove some one of the five links just named is relevant. For example, no quotations which are simply laudatory of S. Peter, but which go no further than ranking him foremost of the Apostles, and none which speak of the Roman Church as an Apostolic See, but do not attribute to it a preponderating authority in Christendom, are to the point. They may be, and constantly are, adduced as though they helped to prove the privilege of Peter; but in fact they do nothing of the sort. Foremost amongst such irrelevant citations are those which speak of S. Peter as 'Prince of the Apostles.' The modern use of the word 'Prince,' to denote superior and even sovereign rank, naturally misleads those who do not know that the Latin *princeps*, from which it is derived, has no such necessary meaning, but originally denoted no more than 'first in time or order.' And in this sense, just as S. Peter is called 'Prince of the Apostles,' as indeed S. Andrew is also by S. Jerome on Psalm lxviii., so is S. Stephen called 'Prince of the Martyrs,' without any superior authority being thereby attributed to him over them. The mistake generated in this way may be compared to that which would be caused if some person, noticing in a Peerage that the Duke of Norfolk is 'Premier' Duke and Earl of England, were not merely to suppose that he is the holder of the first Duchy and Earldom ever created in England, but that he and the Dukes his predecessors have always been the heads of the Executive, as Prime Ministers of the Crown, because such is a modern use of the word 'Premier.'

Once more.—It must be steadily borne in mind that no evidence which merely goes to show that S. Peter stands forth conspicuously as the representative of the unity and authority of the Church, and as for a time its most prominent member, is of the least value either in behalf of the alleged privilege. What is needed is proof that S. Peter represents, not the Church, but Christ; that he is, in short, in his double relation to the Head and to the Body, not what (to borrow a parallel from civil society) the President of a Legislative Chamber is, but what a Regent under an absolute monarchy is, in the absence of the King.

Again, no testimony of a writer who uses inconsistent and incompatible language on the points in debate can be received in favour of the claim, unless his affirmative words be later than, and in formal retraction of, his negative ones.

Fourthly, no Pope can be accepted as evidence in his own favour, because of the universal maxim of law, 'No man may be judge in his own cause.' But admissions made by Popes adverse to their own alleged privilege are good proof against it; just as, in a common question of ownership, as of a purse picked up in the street, a disclaimer of right in it carries conviction of the speaker's truth much more perfectly than an assertion of ownership would do, because, in the former case, the statement is against the interest of the person who makes it.

Fifthly, words must be invariably brought to the test of deeds. It is a common device of Protestant controversialists, for example, to dilute and minimise the strong language of certain Fathers on the Holy Eucharist by describing it as merely rhetorical metaphor, not to be literally construed. But when this language is brought to the test of the ancient Liturgies, which, both in their words and acts, denote the practical belief of the Churches which used them, it is at once found that the Fathers are actually less fervid and, so to say, 'extreme' than the Liturgies in their diction. It will be shown later what light the acts of Tertullian, of S. Cyprian, of S. Augustine, and other eminent Christian writers, shed on their language with regard to the Petrine claims.

The importance of the Liturgies as sources of evidence is due not only to their great antiquity, but still more to the fact that they testify to a great deal more than any patristic citations can do, for what whole Churches and nations said officially and authoritatively every day for several centuries together is much weightier than what a single ecclesiastical writer said but once, and that perhaps informally, and almost certainly in his private capacity, pledging no one but himself. The nearly universal custom in these Liturgies of commemorating the most eminent Saints by name in the oblation is important to bear in mind, as it must certainly have led to the specific mention of S. Peter in most, if not all of them, if his rank be as alleged by Ultramontanes.

It will not be necessary to cite all the extant Liturgies, for a comparatively small number of extracts will display the whole evidence :—

a. Liturgy of S. James, or norm of Palestine.—In the course of the Prayer of Invocation of the Holy Ghost on the

oblations occur these two highly significant passages:—(1.) 'For the stablishing of Thy Holy Catholic Church, which *Thou hast founded on the rock of the faith*, that the gates of hell may not prevail against it.' (2.) 'Especially for the glorious Zion, the *Mother of all the Churches*.'

b. Liturgy of S. Mark, or norm of Egypt.—There are three items of evidence in this document:—(1.) The first place in the commemoration of ecclesiastical persons is assigned to the Pope or Patriarch of Alexandria, who is described in one passage as 'pre-ordained to rule over Thy Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.' (2.) The only Saints commemorated by name are the Blessed Virgin and S. Mark, as founders of the See of Alexandria. (3.) The order of commemoration of places gives the first rank to Jerusalem, the second, perhaps to Rome, but as probably to Constantinople at a later time, and the third to Alexandria, thus:—'Remember, O Lord, the Holy city of our God, Jesus Christ, *and the imperial city*, and this city of ours.'

c. Liturgy of the Holy Apostles, or Nestorian norm of Persia.—No evidence.

d. Liturgy of S. Clement.—One clause alone in this ancient document—and that most probably an interpolation by the anonymous compiler of the Apostolical Constitutions some time in the fourth century—is relevant, and it puts the Bishop of Jerusalem first, of Rome second, and either of Antioch or Alexandria third, thus:—'For every episcopate under heaven of those who rightly divide the word of Thy truth, let us make our supplication; and for our Bishop James and his parishes, let us make our supplication; for the Bishop Clement and his parishes let us make our supplication; for our Bishop Evodius [*al.* Anianus] and his parishes, let us make our supplication.'

e. Liturgy of S. Basil the Great, or norm of Syro-Greek Church.—No evidence, save that the Blessed Virgin and S. John Baptist are the only saints commemorated by name, and that the local prelate is the first named in the Great Intercession.

f. Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, or norm of Constantinople.—As S. Basil.

g. Coptic S. Basil, or norm of the Coptic Church.—(1.) In the Prayer of Absolution the Twelve Apostles are mentioned collectively, and next S. Mark is named specifically, followed by some other names. (2.) The Pope of Alexandria occupies the first place in the Intercession. (3.) There is a prayer in honour of S. Paul after the Epistle, as being the chief preacher

of the Gospel. (4.) In a copious commemoration of Saints, the only New Testament names are S. Mary, S. John Baptist, S. Stephen, and S. Mark. (5.) In the Prayer of Absolution to the Father, the text S. Matt. xvi. 18, 19, is embodied thus:—
 ‘ . . . Thou art He who sayest to Peter our father, by the mouth of Thine only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, “Thou art Peter . . . loosed in heaven;” so then, O Lord, let my father and brethren be absolved out of my mouth, by Thy Holy Spirit, O merciful lover of men.’

The ground of the citation here, therefore, is not to allege any special privilege of Peter, but to base on the grant of the power of the keys to the whole Church in his person the right of the individual celebrant to pronounce absolution.

h. Ordo Communis, or norm of Syro-Jacobites.—(1.) There is an exclamation after the Epistle, ‘Glory to the Lord of Paul, of the Prophets, and of the Apostles.’ (2.) The Four Evangelists are commemorated by name after the Gospel has been read. No mention of S. Peter occurs.

i. Syriac S. James.—‘Remember, O Lord, the holy Bishops . . . who from James, *first of Bishops*, Apostle and Martyr, unto this day have preached the word,’ &c.

j. Syriac S. Peter the Apostle, I. and II.—The former of these commemorates only S. Mary, S. John Baptist, and S. Stephen by name; the latter S. Mary alone. They contain no other evidence.

k. Armenian Liturgy.—S. Mary, S. John Baptist, S. Stephen, and the Apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew, are the only New Testament Saints enumerated.

l. Liturgy of Malabar, or norm of Christians of S. Thomas.—The only Apostle commemorated by name is S. Thomas.

m. Liturgy of Nestorius.—No evidence.

n. Ambrosian Missal.—No relevant evidence, even in the office of SS. Peter and Paul, but there is one phrase in the Collect for S. Peter’s Chair, which may be maximised or minimised according to the bias with which it is read:—‘O God, who didst this day hallow the Pontificate of Thy blessed Apostle Peter, grant that Thy Church, spread throughout the world, may be always ruled by his governance [*ejus magisterio gubernari*], from whom it derived the beginning of religion.’

o. Mozarabic Missal, or norm of Spanish Church [tampered with by Roman hands in comparatively recent times].—(1.) S. Peter, ‘Prince of the Apostles,’ is specially named, along with S. Mary, in a prayer for absolution at the beginning of the office. (2.) The Pope of Rome is alone specified by name as joining in the act of oblation which all

the clergy are said to offer. (3.) S. Peter is named in the commemoration of Saints at the head of the Apostles and Evangelists, but after S. Mary, S. Zacharias, S. John [Baptist], and Holy Innocents. (4.) The Collect for S. Peter's Chair begins:—‘O God, Son of God, who didst exalt Peter upon Thyself, the most solid Rock, and upon Peter the Church,’ &c.

p. Gallican Missal.—This office does, indeed, in a collect, speak of S. Peter as ‘fundator Ecclesiæ,’ and in the Collect for S. Peter's Chair as ‘caput Ecclesiæ;’ but in the *Contestatio* of that day are the crucial words:—‘In cujus confessione est fundamentum ecclesiæ; nec adversus hanc petram portæ inferi prævalent.’

q. The Old German Missal, which, however, cannot be older than the middle of the eighth century, and probably bears the marks of the strong Roman zeal of S. Boniface, is the only one which contains testimony directly favourable to the Petrine claims. In the Preface for S. Peter's Chair we read:—‘From amongst which [Saints] Thou didst make ruler and keeper [*præsulem et custodem*] of Thy heavenly enclosures Blessed Peter, called to the Apostolate by the mouth of our Lord and God, Thy Word Himself, and appointed Prince of the Apostles because of his confession of Christ, Thine only begotten Son, and placed, with a change of name, in the foundation of Thine house, the right being divinely conferred on him that what he decreed on earth shall be made good in heaven.’ This case is specially useful as serving to shew what kind of evidence we are entitled to require from the ancient Liturgies, but do not find there.

r. Roman Missal.—The evidence of this document, which is very important against the privilege, will be set down a little later under another heading, for a reason there assigned.

The liturgical evidence is thus shown to be either positively against the Petrine claims, or negatively incapable of being cited in their favour, although it is quite certain that, if any such view of S. Peter's peculiar rank as Head of the Church and Vicar of Christ had prevailed as unquestionably did prevail as to S. John Baptist's exceptional position as herald and forerunner of Christ, we should find proof of it in the Liturgies.

Before entering on the second stage of inquiry—that which is concerned with the writings of the Fathers—it is expedient to say a few words about the authority they individually possess. No person can be formally enrolled amongst the Saints by canonization, unless after the strictest inquiry it be established that nothing which he wrote, even if unpublished,

contained any doctrinal error whatever : or else, supposing him to have written aught which contradicted the known teaching of the Church in his day, evidence of retraction must be adduced—(*Decret. Urbani VIII.* ; *Bened. XIV. De Servi Dei Beatificat.* ii. 26, 2). Nevertheless, this does not make the teaching of any Saint unimpeachable, if valid grounds of objection can be stated against it, but only makes its tenability probable—(*Bened. XIV. De Servi Dei Beatificatione*, ii. 32, 12). But if the Saint be also a Doctor of the Church, then his doctrine may not be impugned at all, because he has not merely taught *in* the Church, but has taught the Church itself—(*Bened. XIV. De Canonizatione*, iv. 2 ; xi. 11). And, accordingly, the great majority of the subjoined citations are taken from Doctors of the Church, whose authority is not open to criticism from Roman Catholics. Authors who are not counted amongst the Saints, and especially such as are charged with heresy, may be quoted to prove an historical fact, but not to establish doctrine. And nothing short of the *unanimous consent* of the Fathers may lawfully be followed by any Roman Catholic in the interpretation of Scripture—(*Creed of Pius IV.* par. 3).

This does not mean, obviously, that the silence of even a considerable number of Fathers on any point is conclusive against it, but only that all such as do treat of it must be substantially agreed in their view, and neither contradict one another nor oppose the opinion sought to be maintained by their testimony. Of course silence is sometimes very weighty adverse evidence, when the scope and circumstances of any patristic or conciliar document seem to call for express mention of the point in discussion, and yet no such mention is found. But it is the peculiarity of the Petrine privilege that its importance as a central dogma of Christianity (which it must be if the relation of every human soul to God depend on its relation to the Roman See) is so great, that it could no more be left out of sight by any appreciable number of Christian writers than the Incarnation or the Atonement ; and, consequently, silence is in this case a very serious contradiction.

It will be convenient, as matter of arrangement, to restrict the inquiry at first to the opinions expressed by the Fathers upon the three capital texts of Scripture which are used as the basis of the Petrine privilege ; namely, S. Matt. xvi. 18, S. Luke xxii. 32, and S. John xxi. 15–17.

What, then, do the Fathers say as to the Rock of the Church, the prayer for Peter's steadfastness, and the commission to feed the sheep ?

VOL. VII.—NO. XIII.

C

There is a scantiness of reference to these topics in the whole ante-Nicene period which is simply unaccountable on any hypothesis of their vital or central importance. Out of the following authors and books—Ignatius, Clement, Polycarp, Hermas, Papias, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, Clementine Recognitions and Homilies, Apostolical Constitutions, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Caius, Asterius, Alexander of Jerusalem, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Methodius, Lactantius, Peter of Alexandria, Alexander of Alexandria, Cyprian, Firmilian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Archelaus—only six make any reference at all to S. Matthew xvi. 18. One of these, S. Hippolytus, in his *Discourse on the Holy Theophany*, is speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit, and says, 'By this Spirit Peter spake that blessed word, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." By this Spirit the Rock of the Church is established.' No conclusion can be drawn either way from this citation.

S. Cyprian, Doctor of the Church, in the first place where he quotes the text, Ep. xxvii., begins by saying that it serves to explain 'the honour of a Bishop and the Order of the Church, . . . so that the Church is founded on the Bishops.' In the second citation of it, in his treatise on the Unity of the Church, he glosses it (and S. John xxi. 15, cited in the same sentence) by saying: 'The Lord . . . that He might set forth unity, He arranged by His authority the origin of that unity, as beginning from one. *Assuredly the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was Peter*, endowed with a like partnership *both of honour and power*; but the beginning proceeds from unity.'

S. Firmilian actually quotes the text to prove that Pope S. Stephen was in error, folly, and blindness by permitting heretical baptisms to be counted valid, and was thereby introducing many other rocks and Churches instead of one only, at the very time that he was boasting of his succession from Peter, on whom the foundations of the Church were laid.—*Ep. lxxv. in Opp. S. Cypriani.*

The three remaining witnesses are the Clementine Homilies, Origen, and Tertullian. But the first of these is rejected by the Roman Church, ever since the Synod under Pope Gelasius in 494, as spurious and heretical, and therefore its testimony (chap. xix.) that S. Peter describes himself as 'a firm rock, the foundation of the Church,' cannot be adduced.

Nor is anything lost to the Ultramontane cause by refusing to admit this apocryphal testimony, since, even though S.

Peter is the hero of its romantic narrative, S. James is described throughout as the chief bishop and arbiter of Christian doctrine, exercising authority over S. Peter himself—a fact in itself inconsistent with the universal prevalence of the opposite view at the date of the book.

Origen says that 'the Rock is every disciple of Christ, from whom they drank who drank of the spiritual rock which followed them, and on every such rock every ecclesiastical word is builded, and the plan of life according to His pattern But if thou thinkest that the whole Church is built by God on S. Peter alone, what dost thou say of John, the son of thunder, and every one of the Apostles? Or shall we dare to say that the gates of hell were not to prevail against Peter in particular, but that they were to prevail against the other Apostles and perfect ones? Is it not true for each and all, what was said before, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and also that other saying, "Upon this rock I will build my Church?"' And he goes on to say that all who make S. Peter's confession of Christ their Rock, become the same as Peter.—*Comm. in S. Matt.* xvi. 18.

Tertullian alone remains, and his two citations of S. Matt. xvi. 18 are in treatises written after he fell, as is alleged, into Montanist heresy. In the former of these, *De Præscript. Hæret.* xxii., he confines himself to saying, 'Peter, who is called the Rock on which the Church should be built;' but in the latter, *De Pudicitia*, xxi., he insists strongly, and at length, that the privilege of Peter died with him, and was incapable of transmission, so that he was the Rock only in the sense of founding the Church by being its first preacher, and that the power of binding and loosing, conferred on Peter alone *personally*, could not be derived to, nor exercised by, any Church claiming to be akin to Peter; while that even as regards Peter himself, his power of binding and loosing referred merely to his action in first unlocking the doors of the kingdom of heaven by administering baptism to the new converts, in abolishing part and retaining part of the Mosaic law, and in his miracles upon the lame man and upon Ananias. And in two other places, *Adv. Jud.* ix. and *Adv. Marcion.* iv. 13, Tertullian restricts the title of Rock to Christ.

That is the whole which the ante-Nicene Church has to tell us on S. Matt. xvi. 18.

As to S. Luke xxii. 31, only four ante-Nicene writers cite it. Of these, two, S. Ignatius, in the *Epistle to the Smyrneans*, and the Apostolical Constitutions, vi. 5. iv., actually refer to it as if worded in the plural throughout and referring to all

the Apostles, and not to S. Peter singly, albeit the original text is in the singular. Tertullian (*De Fuga*) uses the text merely to show that the Devil's power is limited, so that he cannot tempt Christians further than he is expressly permitted. S. Cyprian quotes it twice (*Epist.* vii. 5, and *De Orat. Domini* 30), in each case employing it in proof of Christ's intercessory office for all sinners, and making no special application of it to S. Peter.

S. John xxi. 15 is but twice cited, once by S. Cyprian in the passage of the treatise on Unity already quoted above, where he alleges the commission of feeding the sheep to extend to every Apostle alike; and it occurs again in a very obscurely worded sentence in a letter from the clergy of Rome to those of Carthage, on S. Cyprian's withdrawal during a persecution. After quoting our Lord's words about Himself as the Good Shepherd, in contrast to the hireling that leaveth the sheep to the wolf and fleeth, they go on: 'To Simon, too, He speaks thus: "Lovest thou Me?" He answered, I do love Thee. He saith to him, Feed My sheep.' We know that these words came to pass by reason of the very act whereby he [Peter] withdrew, and the other disciples did the like.'—*Ep.* ii. in *Opp. S. Cypr.* The simplest interpretation of this difficult passage is that the Roman clergy read the text in the light of a rebuke to S. Peter for fleeing and denying his Master, and as a warning not to neglect his pastoral duties another time.

This is absolutely the whole which the Fathers of the three first centuries have to tell us as to the three clauses of the Petrine grant of privilege, and apart from the ominous silence of the great majority, the words of those who do speak are of curiously little help to the claim. There is, of course, a good deal of other evidence in the writers of the early period yet to be considered, but as interpreters of the letter of Scripture, they have no more to give us on this special topic.

If the inquiry be carried down somewhat lower, still confining it strictly to the interpretation of these three texts, the case for the claim of privilege will not be strengthened:—

S. MATT. xvi. 18.

S. HILARY OF POITIERS, Doctor of the Church.—'Upon this rock of the confession is the building up of the Church . . . This faith is the foundation of the Church. Through this faith the gates of hell are powerless against it. This faith hath the keys of the heavenly kingdom.'—*De Trinit.* vi. 36, 37.

S. EPIPHANIUS, Doctor of the Church.—'Peter, the foremost of

the Apostles, who became to us a truly solid rock, laying the foundation of the faith of the Lord, on which (faith) the Church is in all respects built. And that first because he confessed Christ, the Son of the living God, and heard that "Upon this rock of unshaken faith I will build My Church."—*Adv. Hæc.* lib. ii. tom. i. 8.

'He also reveals the Holy Spirit (Acts v. 3), for this befitted the first of the Apostles, the strong rock on which the Church of God is built, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'—*Ancor.* ix.

S. BASIL, Doctor of the Church.—'The Church of God, whose foundations are upon the holy hills; for it is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. One of these mountains was Peter, on which rock the Lord promised that He would build His Church. For sublime and lofty minds, lifted high above earthly things, are fitly styled mountains. But the lofty mind of blessed Peter is named a lofty rock, because it was deeply rooted in the faith and abode firmly and unshrinkingly the blows inflicted by temptation. All those who acquire knowledge of the Godhead, through greatness of mind, and of actions proceeding from mind, perfected in sound life, they are the tops of the mountains upon which the house of God is built. . . . It may be that he is speaking of an escape from the evils he specified above; to wit, entering into the hole of the rock (Isa. ii. 19), that is, the steadfastness of faith in Christ. That is where Moses was placed when about to see God. . . . But collate whatever is said in Scripture concerning the Rock, that the passage may be cleared up for thee.'—*Comm. in Esaiam* ii. 66, 85.

S. GREGORY NAZIANZEN, Doctor of the Church.—'Do you notice how, when all Christ's disciples were lofty and worthy of election, one is called a Rock, and puts his faith in the foundations of the Church (*καὶ τοῖς θεμελίοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας πιστεύεται*), while another is better loved, and rests on the bosom of Jesus, and the remaining disciples admit their superior honour.'—*Orat.* xxvi.

S. AMBROSE, Doctor of the Church :—

'Præco diei jam sonat—
Noctis profundæ pervigil,

Hoc ipsa Petra ecclesiæ
Canente culpam diluit'

Hymn Æterne Rerum Conditor.

('Lo, even the very Church's Rock
Melts at the crowing of the cock.')

'This is that Peter to whom Christ said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Therefore where Peter is, there is the Church; where the Church is, there is no death, but life eternal. And therefore He adds: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." That blessed Peter, against whom the gates of hell prevailed not, did not close the gates of heaven against himself; but, on the contrary, destroyed the entrances of hell, and made manifest the

entrances of heaven. Being, therefore, placed on earth, he opened heaven and closed hell.'—*In Psalm xl. Enarr.* 30.

'This then is Peter, who answered for the other Apostles, yea, before the others, and therefore is called the foundation, because he not only knew how to preserve that which belonged to himself, but that which was common to others. Christ expressed his assent to him, the Father made revelation to him. For whoso speaketh truly of generation from the Father got it from the Father, and not from the flesh. Faith is therefore the foundation of the Church; for it was not said of Peter's person [*lit.* flesh], but of his faith, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, but his confession conquered hell.'—*De Incarn. Dom.* 33, 34.

'The rock is Christ. "For they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ." However, He did not deny the favour of this epithet to His disciple, that he should be Peter, because he had steadfastness of constancy, firmness of faith, from the rock. Strive, therefore, that thou, too, mayest be a rock. Look, therefore, for the rock not outside thyself, but within thee. Thine act is a rock, thy thought is a rock. Thine house is built on this rock that it may not be shaken by any storms of spiritual wickedness. Thy faith is a rock: faith is the foundation of the Church. If thou be a rock, thou shalt be in the Church, because the Church is on the rock. If thou be in the Church, the gates of hell shall not prevail against thee.'—*Expos. in Lucam* vi. 97, 98.

'That starry sky . . . is the high firmament of heaven, nor is this other firmament unlike it, of which it is said, "Upon this rock will I build my Church." . . . They sucked oil out of the firm rock, for the rock was the flesh of Christ, which redeemed heaven and the whole world.'—*Ep.* xliii. 9.

S. JEROME, Doctor of the Church.—'I speak with the successor of the Fisherman and a disciple of the Cross. I, following no chief save Christ, am counted in communion with your Blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. On that rock I know the Church is built. Whoso eats the lamb outside this house is profane.'—*Epist. ad Damasum Papam*, A.D. 376.

'Christ is the rock, Who granted to His Apostles that they should be called rocks: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."—*Comm. in Amos* vi. 12, A.D. 392.

'But thou sayest the Church is founded on Peter, albeit the very same thing is also done upon all the Apostles, and they all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the Church is stablished on them all equally; nevertheless, one out of the twelve is chosen, that by the appointment of a head, the chance of division might be averted. . . . '—*Adv. Jovin.* ii. A.D. 393.

'Was there any other province in the whole world which admitted the preaching of pleasure, into which the wily serpent crept, save that which the teaching of Peter had founded on Christ the Rock?'—*Adv. Jovin.* ii. circa finem, A.D. 393.

'Upon this rock the Lord founded His Church; from this rock the Apostle Peter derived his name. . . . The foundation which

the Apostle, as architect, laid is our Lord Jesus Christ alone. On this foundation the Church of Christ is built.—*Comm. in Matt.* vii. 24, 25, A.D. 398.

‘As He gave light to the Apostles, that they might be called the light of the world, and they obtained other titles from the Lord, so also to Simon, who believed in Christ the Rock, He gave the name of Peter, and according to the metaphor of a rock, it is rightly said, “I will build my Church on thee.”’—*Comm. in Matt.* xvi. 18, A.D. 398.

S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, Doctor of the Church.—‘“And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church,” that is, upon the faith of his confession (τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας).’—*Hom.* 54 in *Matt.* xxvi. sect. 2.

S. ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM.—‘Christ, Who searcheth the hearts, did not ask His disciples, “Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?” because He did not know the varying opinion of men concerning Himself, but was desirous of teaching all that same confession which Peter, inspired by Him, laid as the basis and foundation on which the Lord built His Church.’—*Epist.* 235.

‘Christ is the Rock, abiding unshaken, when He was incarnate.’—*Ep.* 416.

S. AUGUSTINE, Doctor of the Church.—‘At the same time while I was a priest (A.D. 392–395), I wrote a book against the Letter of Donatus . . . in which book I said in a certain place of the Apostle Peter that the Church was founded on him as on a rock, an interpretation which is also sung by the lips of many in the verses of blessed Ambrose, where he speaks of the cock, “Lo, even the very Church’s Rock melts at the crowing of the cock.” But I know that afterwards I most frequently (*sepiissime*) have thus explained what the Lord said, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church,” that it should be understood as upon Him Whom Peter confessed, saying, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” and that Peter, named from this Rock, represented the person of the Church, which is built on the Rock, and received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him, Thou art the rock (*petra*), but thou art Peter. For Christ was the Rock, Whom Simon confessing, as the whole Church confesses Him, was called Peter.’—*Retract.* i. xxi., A.D. 428.

‘The first of the Apostles . . . signified the Church universal . . . because it is founded upon the rock, whence Peter received his name. For the rock is not from Peter, but Peter from the rock, just as Christ is not called from Christian, but Christian from Christ. Therefore it is that the Lord saith, “Upon this rock will I build My Church,” because Peter had said, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” Upon this rock, this rock which thou hast confessed, I will build My Church. For Christ was the rock, on which foundation Peter himself was built. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus. Therefore the Church, which is founded on Christ, received from Him the keys of the kingdom of heaven in Peter, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins.’—*Tract. in Evang. Joann.* cxxiv. 5.

S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, Doctor of the Church.—‘That which He named a rock, referring to his name, was nought else, I think, than the unshaken and most firm faith of the disciple, on which also the Church of Christ was founded and established.’

THEODORET.—‘For this reason Christ our Master suffered the first of the Apostles, whose confession he laid as the kind of basis or foundation of the Church, to be shaken and to err, and to raise him up again, teaching two things by the one act, not to trust themselves and stablish the wavering.’—*Epist.* lxxvii.

S. LEO THE GREAT, Pope and Doctor.—‘The solidity of the foundation on which the lofty building of the whole Church is erected, fails not by reason of the mass of the temple which rests upon it. For the solidity of that faith which was praised in the Prince of the Apostles is perpetual. And so, as that abides, which Peter believed in Christ, so that too abides which Christ instituted in Peter. . . . Therefore the appointment of the Truth abides, and blessed Peter persevering in that strength of the rock which he received, hath never quitted the governance of the Church which he received. For so he was ordained before the others, that whilst he is called the Rock, whilst he is declared the foundation, whilst he is constituted doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven, and arbiter of things to be bound and loosed . . . we should know by the mystery of these titles what is his fellowship with Christ. . . . That confession which, inspired by God the Father in the Apostle’s heart, rises above all the uncertainties of human opinions, received the firmness of the rock, which cannot be shaken by any impacts. For, throughout the Church Universal Peter daily saith, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” and every tongue which confesses the Lord is imbued with the authority of this voice. This faith conquers the Devil, and looses the bonds of his captives. This delivers men from the world and places them in heaven, and the gates of hell cannot prevail against it. For it has been divinely established with such firmness that neither heretical pravity was ever able to corrupt it, nor pagan unbelief to overcome it.’—*Serm.* ii. on Anniversary of his Consecration.

S. GREGORY THE GREAT, Pope and Doctor.—‘The Son of God is the Beginning. In this beginning the earth was founded, because the Church is founded on Him. Hence the Apostle saith, “Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, Jesus Christ.” Hence He Himself, the mediator of God and man, saith to the Prince of the Apostles, “Thou art Peter, upon this Rock I will build My Church.” For He is the Rock from which Peter derived his name, and on which He said that He would build the Church.’—*Comm. in Ps.* ci. 27.

VENERABLE BEDE, Doctor.—‘He received the name of Peter from the Lord, because he chose faith from a steadfast mind to Him of Whom it is written, “And that Rock was Christ,” and “Upon the Rock,” that is, upon the Lord the Saviour, who gave to Him, knowing, loving, and confessing Him faithfully, a share in his own Name, so that he should be called Peter, from the Rock on which the Church is built.’—*Hom. in Matt.* xvi. 18.

S. Gregory VII., Pope, sending a crown to Rudolf of Rheinfelden, to stir him up against the Emperor Henry IV., added the following line:—

‘Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho,’
 (‘The Rock gave the diadem to Peter, Peter to Rodolf’).

Baronius, *Ann.*

It is unnecessary to carry this chain of evidence down further, though it may be largely amplified from early and later writers. It is sufficient to say that only two of the passages just cited are even patient of the Ultramontane interpretation, namely, the first citation from S. Jerome, and the fuller context of the citation from S. Leo the Great, which makes very lofty claims indeed for the Papacy. As regards S. Jerome, apart from a very old debate as to what he meant (seeing that the whole scope of the letter is an appeal to the Trinitarian teaching at Rome against the prevalent Arianism of the East, and may, therefore, be very reasonably interpreted of communion in faith with the orthodox Pope Damasus), and that the great Erasmus glosses the passage thus,—

‘Not on Rome [was the Church built], as I think, for it might happen that Rome also should become degenerate, but upon that faith which Peter professed, which hitherto the Roman Church has preserved;’

there is the weighty fact that, even if we interpret the *Epistle to Damasus* in the most hyper-Papal sense, it is *sixteen years earlier* than the oldest of the five other contradictory passages cited from S. Jerome, whose maturer and final opinion must be judged by them, just as S. Augustine’s retraction of his first view about S. Peter being the Rock, settles his judgment on that point. And it is a weighty fact that S. Leo, when making very large claims indeed for the ‘privilege of Peter,’ and for himself as Peter’s heir, is obliged to contradict himself by admitting that the Catholic faith is the Church’s foundation.

There is, then, not merely no ‘unanimous consent’ of the Fathers in favour of Peter being the Rock, but there is a powerful preponderance of adverse testimony. However, though some, although but few, of the Fathers do call Peter the Rock of the Church, nevertheless, *this view is not open, even as a mere pious opinion*, to any Roman Catholic. Two clauses of the Creed of Pius IV. bar it effectually, namely, the second, which binds to acceptance of ‘apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same (holy Roman) Church,’ and the eleventh, already cited,

obliging to the definitions of the Councils, and chiefly that of Trent.

Now the Roman Missal is a formulary of the highest authority in the Latin Church, and not only includes many 'apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions,' but is the chief storehouse of 'observances' in worship.

But the Collect for the Vigil of SS. Peter and Paul runs thus:—

'Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, that Thou wouldst not suffer us, whom thou hast established *upon the rock of the Apostolic confession*, to be shaken by any disturbances;'

while the only evidence it contains capable of being cited on the other side is that SS. Peter and Paul are named together in the Confession, but after S. John Baptist; and again together in the Canon, *infra actionem*, at the head of the list of Apostles and Martyrs there commemorated.

And the Council of Trent, in its solemn decree upon the Symbol of the Faith, speaks thus, after a long preamble:—

'Wherefore it [the Council] judged that the symbol of the Faith, which the Holy Roman Church uses, should be set forth in the full wording whereby it is read in all Churches, as that principle in which all who confess the faith of Christ must needs agree, and as *the firm and only foundation, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail*, which is of this sort: "I believe in one God," &c.'

Consequently, any Roman Catholic who alleges that S. Matt. xvi. 18 refers to S. Peter's person, subjects himself to anathema, inasmuch as the Missal and the Council of Trent declare that the Rock is the faith contained in the Nicene Creed. No doubt there is a rival anathema in the Vatican decrees, awaiting those who hold the Tridentine view, but the decisions of Trent are much more certainly valid and binding in the Church of Rome than those of the Vatican, whose canonical legality is open to the most serious question, and which merely serve, by this contradiction, as a useful touchstone for Infallibility.

S. LUKE xxii. 31, 32.

The next part of the inquiry is the interpretation put by the Fathers on Christ's address to S. Peter at the Last Supper, and whether they take it as a grant of infallibility and jurisdiction. There is much less evidence of any kind producible as to this text than for the preceding one, from the curious fact, familiar to all Biblical students, of the compara-

tive paucity of comments on S. Luke's Gospel. However, there is quite enough to settle the question :—

S. HILARY OF POITIERS, Doctor.—‘As for what he said, “If it be possible,” &c. (S. Matt. xxvi. 39), He taught its meaning plainly in what He says to Peter : “Behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.” For they all had to be tried by this cup of the Lord's Passion. And the Father is besought for Peter, lest his faith should fail, that at all events the grief of repentance might not be wanting to the weakness of the sinner, for in case he did repent, then this faith would not fail in him.’—*De Trin.* x. 38.

S. BASIL THE GREAT, Doctor.—‘Thou art not more honourable than blessed Peter the Apostle. For thou canst not excel in love one who loved so vehemently as to be willing to die for Him. But because he spoke too confidently, when he said, “Though all should be offended in Thee, yet will I never be offended,” he was given up to human cowardice, and fell into denial, instructed in caution by his fall, and taught to spare the weak by learning his own weakness ; and to know clearly that just as when he was drowning in the sea, he was rescued by Christ's right hand, so when in danger of perishing in the stormy sea of offence through lack of faith, he was preserved by Christ's power, Who had moreover foretold him what would happen, saying, “Simon, Simon,” &c. And Peter, thus rebuked, was fitly aided and taught to lay aside his vanity, and to spare the weak.’—*Hom. de Humilitate.*

S. AMBROSE, Doctor.—The first thing to be remarked is, that S. Ambrose passes over S. Luke xxii. 31, 32 altogether in his Commentary on that Gospel—a fact inconsistent with his having attached the importance or the meaning to it which it assumes when adduced as one clause of the Petrine grant of privilege. He does explain it, however, in another part of his writings :—

‘Peter is winnowed, that he may be forced to deny Christ. He falls into temptation, he speaks some things full, as it were, of chaff ; but he spake in word that he might be better stablished in affection. At last he wept, and washed away his chaff, and by these temptations he obtained Christ's intercession for him. . . . At length Peter is set over the Church after being tempted by the Devil. And so the Lord signifies beforehand that which came to pass afterwards, in that He chose him to be shepherd of the Lord's flock. For he said to him : “When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.” Therefore the holy Apostle Peter was converted into good corn, and was winnowed as wheat, that he might be one bread unto the family of God for our food.’—*Comm. in Ps. xlii.* 41.

S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, Doctor.—‘Hear what He saith, “I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.” For this He said sharply reproving him, and showing that his fall was more grievous than that

of the rest, and needed more help. . . . And why, if Satan desired all, did He not say concerning all, "I have prayed for *you*?" Is it not quite plain that it is this, which I have mentioned before, that it is as reproving him, and showing that his fall was more grievous than that of the rest, that He directs His words to him.—*Hom. 82 in Matt. xxvi.*

S. AUGUSTINE, Doctor.—"And take not the word of truth utterly out of thy mouth" (Ps. cxix. 43). The word of truth was not utterly taken out of Peter's mouth, in whom was a type of the Church, for though he denied for a time when troubled with fear, yet he was amended by weeping, and afterwards crowned by confessing. But when he says, "Take not," it is to be understood, "Suffer not to be taken," therefore we say in praying, "Lead us not into temptation." And the Lord Himself to Peter, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not;" that is, lest the word of truth be taken out of thy mouth *utterly*.—*Hom. xiii. in Ps. cxviii.*

The text is also cited several times in relation to the Pelagian heresy, as illustrating the necessity of grace to assist man's free-will, and notably by S. Jerome, Doctor (*Adv. Pelag.*), S. Augustine, Doctor (*De Grat. et Lib. Arb.* 9), and S. Prosper (*De Lib. Arbit. ad Ruffin.* xi.), but they all give it a general interpretation, as illustrating a doctrine affecting every man alike, so that in absolute strictness their testimony does not help to decide the question either way, save so far as their silence makes against the Ultramontane gloss, which, in truth, cannot be traced to any earlier writer than Cardinal Bellarmine, A.D. 1621.

S. JOHN xxi. 15-17.

S. GREGORY NAZIANZEN, Doctor.—"Do you not receive repentant David, whose gift of prophecy repentance saved? Nor the great Peter, when he suffered somewhat from human weakness in the matter of the Lord's Passion? But Jesus received him, and by the threefold questioning and confession, healed the threefold denial."—*Orat. xxxix. for Epiphany.*

S. AMBROSE, Doctor.—"It was said to him thrice, "Feed My sheep," as though he had covered his sin by his exceeding love. . . . Finally, some have said that the triple question as to his love was put, because the denial had been triple, that the profession of love, repeated as often, might blot out the fall of the triple denial."—*Apol. David. i. ix. 50.*

"Thus the threefold answer vouched for his love, or else blotted out the error of the threefold denial."—*De Obiit. Theodos. 19.*

S. EPIPHANIUS, Doctor.—"He became then a strong rock of the building and a foundation of the house of God, when he had denied, and had turned again, and was found by the Lord, and was counted worthy to hear, "Feed my sheep" and "Feed my lambs," and again "Feed my sheep," for Christ, in saying this, led us to the conversion of repentance."

S. AUGUSTINE, Doctor.—‘A threefold confession is rendered for the threefold denial, lest the tongue should serve love less than it had served fear, and lest impending death should seem to have drawn out more words than present life. Let it be the duty of love to feed the Lord’s flock, as it had been the token of fear to deny the Shepherd.’—*Tract. in Evang. Joann.* cxxiii. 5.

‘Fifty, after the resurrection, the Lord committed His sheep to Peter himself to be fed. Not that he was the only one amongst the disciples who attained the feeding of the Lord’s sheep, but when Christ speaks to one, unity is recommended, and to Peter first, because Peter is first of the Apostles. . . . Be not sad, Apostle, answer once, answer twice, answer thrice. Let confession conquer thrice in love, as presumption was conquered thrice in fear. That must be thrice loosed which thou hadst thrice bound.’—*Serm.* ccxcv. 4, in *Nat. SS. Petr. et Paul.*

‘Christ saith this a second and third time, that love might thrice confess what fear had thrice denied. . . . What was entrusted to Peter, what was enjoined to Peter, not Peter only, but the other Apostles also, heard, held, retained; and especially the Apostle Paul, his fellow in martyrdom and festival. They heard these things, and handed them down for us to hear. We feed you, and are fed together with you. . . . Therefore the Lord entrusted His sheep to us, in that He entrusted them to Peter. . . . The Lord commended the sheep to us. We are his sheep. We are his sheep along with you, because we are Christians. I have already said it, we feed and are fed.’—*Serm.* ccxcvi. 3, 5, 17, in *Nat. SS. Petr. et Paul.*

S. CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, Doctor.—‘By this triple confession of blessed Peter, his sin, consisting of a triple denial, was done away, and by the words of our Lord, “Feed my sheep,” a renewal, as it were, of the apostleship already bestowed on him is understood to take place, taking away the shame of his after fall, and taking from him the cowardice of human frailty.’—*Comm. in Evang. Joann.* xxi.

S. BASIL THE GREAT, Doctor.—‘And we are taught this by Christ Himself, when He was appointing Peter as shepherd of the Church after Himself; for He saith, “Peter, lovest thou Me more than these? Feed My sheep;” giving equal authority to all shepherds and teachers thenceforward. And the proof of this is that all bind and loose exactly as he did.’—*Const. Monast.* xxii. 5.

VENERABLE BEDE, Doctor.—‘That which was said to Peter, “Feed My sheep,” was, in truth, said to them all. For the other Apostles were the same that Peter was; but the first place is given to Peter, that the unity of the Church may be commended. They were all shepherds; but the flock is shown to be one, which was then fed by all the Apostles with one mind, and since that time is fed by their successors with a common care.’—*Hom. in Vigil. Petr. et Pauli.*

Two facts come out very clearly in these citations. First, that the Fathers regard the commission of feeding the sheep to be not a special privilege of Peter, but given jointly to all the Apostles; and next, that what *is* peculiar to Peter here in

their mind, is that he was the only Apostle amongst the eleven who had forfeited his rank and authority, and that we have in this place, his restoration to the position which they had held without interruption. And here, consequently, another maxim of the Canon Law applies exactly:—

‘The renewal of a privilege confers no new right, nor does it even confirm an old one [so as to be a fresh grant], but merely maintains whatever held good at first.’—*Decretal. Greg. IX. lib. ii. tit. xxx. 4.*

Accordingly, S. Peter is merely reinstated in whatever position he had acquired in right of the grant in S. Matt. xvi. 9, 18.

It remains to say a few words on one clause of this grant, which has been hitherto passed over in this inquiry. The assumption made up to this point is that the words, ‘I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,’ are fully glossed by the succeeding words, ‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth,’ &c., and denote the same power of remitting and retaining sins which all the other Apostles received, but no more. And this is the general opinion of the more eminent Fathers. A few examples will suffice in evidence:—

ORIGEN.—‘What, are the keys of the kingdom of heaven given by the Lord to Peter only? And shall no other of the blessed receive them? But if this promise, “I will give Thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven” be common to others also, so likewise are all the things that are recorded before and after this as spoken to Peter.’—*Comm. in S. Matt. xvi.*

S. CYPRIAN, Doctor.—‘Our Lord, Whose precepts and commands we are bound to observe, when settling the honour of a bishop and the constitution of His Church, speaketh the Gospel, and saith to Peter, “And I say unto thee . . . And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” &c. Thence, through the changes of times and successions, the ordination of bishops and the constitution of the Church is carried down, so that the Church is set up on the bishops, and every act of the Church is controlled by these same superiors.’—*Epist. xxvii.*

S. AMBROSE, Doctor.—‘Therefore the Lord gave the Apostles that which previously was part of His own judicial authority. . . . Hear Him saying: “I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” &c. What is said to Peter is said to the Apostles.’—*Comm. in Psalm. xxxviii. 37.*

S. HILARY, Doctor.—‘Ye holy and blessed ones [Apostles], who through the merit of your faith received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and obtained the right of binding and loosing in heaven and in earth.’—*De Trinitate vi. 33.*

S. GAUDENTIUS OF BRESCIA.—‘All the Apostles, when Christ rises, receive the keys *in* Peter; nay, rather, they receive the keys of

the kingdom of heaven *with* Peter, when He saith to them, "Receive the Holy Ghost, &c."—*Serm. xvi.*

S. AUGUSTINE, Doctor.—'The Lord Jesus, as you know, chose before His Passion His disciples, whom He named Apostles. Amongst them Peter, almost always alone, was permitted to be the representative person of the whole Church. Because of that personification of the whole Church, which he alone supported, it was his to hear, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." It was not one man who received these, but the unity of the Church . . . when it was said to him, "I will give *thee*" that which was given to all.'—*Serm. ccxcv. 2, in Nat. SS. Pet. et Paul.*

S. LEO THE GREAT, Pope and Doctor.—'Because of that which is said to most blessed Peter, "I will give thee the keys," &c., the right of this power has passed to all the other Apostles also, and the appointment of this decree has descended to all the princes of the Church; but it is not without reason that what is intimated to all is intrusted to one. For it is assigned to Peter singly, because the person of Peter represents all rulers of the Church.'—*Serm. iii. cap. 3.*

Nevertheless, some very few (as S. Cyril of Jerusalem) note the absence of this particular clause from the two cognate grants made to the Apostles collectively (S. Matt. xviii. 18, S. John xx. 23), and urge that some special distinction must be intended, some peculiar privilege belonging to Peter alone. And though Roman Catholics are barred from advocating this view, because the general consent of the Fathers is against it, no such restriction binds non-Romans, who are at liberty to take that which is the more devout and reverent line, that no saying of our Lord is mere surplusage, and without a special force of its own. But when we look for an early interpretation which gives to S. Peter more than the common power of binding and loosing, none is to be found save that of Tertullian, namely, that S. Peter first put the key into the lock, and opened the door of faith to both Jews and Gentiles.

Thus, an examination of the glosses of the Fathers on the three texts alleged for the Petrine privilege results in one of two issues. Either there was no such privilege, as distinguished from the joint powers of the Apostolate, conferred on S. Peter at all; or else—and this is the better way—his special privilege was limited to preaching the first Pentecostal sermon, and afterwards converting Cornelius—events which are absolutely incapable of repetition: even God Himself (if it be lawful to say so) not being able to recall the past, so that no one else, after S. Peter had once done these two things, could be the *first* to teach Jews or Gentiles. No other distinction is named by the ancient Fathers, is claimed by S. Peter himself (Acts xv. 7), or is discoverable in Holy Writ. And,

consequently, if this be the privilege of Peter, it did not merely die with him, but was possible for even himself to exercise not more than twice in his lifetime, so that it is absolutely incommunicable and intransmissible, and incapable of serving as a precedent for any claim whatsoever based on alleged succession to his authority and primacy. If it could be strained to mean anything, it would be that each Pope should start as a missionary pioneer to some country or nation which had not yet received the Gospel. But no Pope has ever done so. With this collapse of the alleged evidence, the whole case for the divine character of the Roman privilege is really gone, and no mind trained in the investigation of testimony, and free from overpowering bias, can do other than dismiss it. But there are various other pleas adduced in its support, one of which, as foremost among them, must now be considered. It is the fact that several titles of honour, dignity, and priority are bestowed on S. Peter in many ancient Christian writings, which are said to imply his unapproachable and pre-eminent authority over the other Apostles. Such epithets are 'first of the leaders' (*πρωτοκορύνφαιος*); 'first in place' (*πρωτοστάτης*); 'chief ruler' (*προεξάρχων*); 'president' (*πρόεδρος*); 'captain' (*ἀρχηγός*); 'prince,' 'head,' and many similar ones.

Now, what these epithets (none of which, by-the-by, is found till the fourth century) *prove*, is the high estimation in which the ancient Church held S. Peter, and the fact that it believed him to enjoy some priority amongst the Apostles. They would be important evidence against any attempt to maintain that, owing to S. Peter's fall and denial, he had, in the belief of early Christians, forfeited his office irreparably (as a strict Novatian might have taught) and had been looked on with a suspicion extending not merely to his rank, but to his teaching, such as we know to have existed against S. Paul.

What they do *not* prove, nor even seem to prove, is the divine grant of supreme jurisdiction. For they are not authoritative titles, either found in Holy Scripture, or conferred by conciliar decree. The fact that nothing in the smallest degree resembling even the least exalted of them is discoverable in the New Testament deprives them of the mark of revelation; the fact that they are not common to the whole Church, leaves them without that of universal consent. They bestow nothing, and they define nothing. But what we are in search of is an express bestowal of exceptional privilege, as divinely revealed and clearly defined. The matter may be illustrated thus. The title 'Great or Grand Duke' in modern Europe

means one of two things, either sovereign authority, as in the case of the Grand Dukes of Baden, Saxe-Weimar, Oldenburg, Hesse, and the two Mecklenburgs, or else membership of the Russian Imperial family.

But the celebrated Duke of Wellington was and is known as the 'Great Duke,' and is frequently so described in English literature, notably in the Laureate's funeral ode. Let us suppose the case of a remote successor of his in the duchy claiming this epithet as hereditary, and as conferring sovereign power, imperial rank, or even precedence over all other English dukes. How would it be treated? Not by a denial of the fact that the epithet was applied to the first Duke of Wellington, nor yet by an attempt to explain away the epithet itself as a mere piece of rhetoric—rather admitting its entire fitness—but by examining the original patent of the dukedom, in order to ascertain if a clause embodying this particular distinction were part of it. And on its absence being certified, it would be at once ruled that however deserved the epithet might be, it was not conferred by any authority capable of bestowing either civil power or social precedence, and must therefore be regarded as a mere personal token of popular admiration, conferring no rights whatever on its subject. Nor would the case for the claim to sovereign rank be mended by advancing proof that the first Duke of Wellington was Prime Minister of the Crown for part of his life, and Commander-in-Chief for a much longer period. For it would have to be shown, in the first place, that these posts connoted irresponsibility to any superior; and in the next, that the patents which bestowed them made them hereditary, and not merely personal. But in S. Peter's case we have the original divine patent, in which no clause of superiority or transmissibility occurs, and no expressions of individual human respect can read an additional title, article, or section into it.

In the second place, the great majority of these epithets occur in documents of the Eastern Church, which has never at any time admitted the Roman claims of supremacy, and which therefore obviously puts no such interpretation on its own language. The Western titles of S. Peter are fewer and far less imposing. And thirdly, not only are equally strong phrases used concerning S. John, and yet more forcible ones concerning S. James, but nearly every one of these special ones is applied to S. Paul as well as to S. Peter; so that even in the modern Roman Church they are grouped together as

'Princes of the Apostles.'¹ So too, when the full heraldic titles of an English Duke are set forth, he is described as 'the High, Puissant, and most Noble Prince,'—words which scarcely seem to allow of rivalry, but which are common to every Peer of the same grade : while all of them have to yield precedence to a mere Baron who happens to be Lord Chancellor, President of the Council, or Lord Privy Seal.

The investigation of the 'Privilege of Peter,' so far as the three most ancient and important sources of testimony, Holy Scripture, early Liturgies, and the comments of the Fathers on the Petrine texts in the Gospels, are concerned, thus results, to say the very least, in failure to establish it. What remains now is rather to find if absolutely conclusive disproof be discoverable ; but that part of the inquiry belongs to the domain of Church history, notably as regards the Councils, which is too extensive to be entered on at present, and must needs be postponed.

ART. II.—THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINES OF IRVINGISM.

1. *The History and Doctrines of Irvingism ; or, the so-called Catholic Apostolic Church.* By EDWARD MILLER, M.A., Vicar of Butlers-Marston, late Tutor of New College, Oxford. Two Vols. (Kegan Paul & Co.)
2. *Records of the Council of the Churches.*—MSS.

It is now nearly half-a-century since London was startled by the announcement that there had been a revival of the miraculous gifts of Pentecost, and that men and women speaking in unknown tongues, and prophesying, were to be heard in the National Scotch Church, in Regent Square, of

¹ S. John is described by S. Chrysostom as the 'pillar of all the Churches throughout the world, who hath the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (*Hom. in S. Johann.*), while S. Paul is called 'the type of the world,' 'the light of the Churches,' 'the basis of the faith,' 'the pillar and ground of the truth.' S. James, yet more strongly, is called by the Clementines, 'bishop of bishops ;' by the Recognitions, i. 68, 'prince of bishops ;' by Ruffinus, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 1, 'bishop of the Apostles ;' and by Hesychius, a priest of Jerusalem, quoted by Photius, 'chief captain of the New Jerusalem,' 'leader of the priests,' 'prince [exarch] of the Apostles,' 'summit of the heights,' &c.

which Edward Irving was then the minister. The announcement fell on ears well prepared to receive any strange tidings. The atmosphere, political and religious, was then surcharged with electricity. The Reform Bill fever was at its height. The first appearance of Cholera at Sunderland had caused a panic throughout the land. There was a widely-spread belief amongst a section of the religious world, who had turned their attention to the study of prophecy, that the second coming of the Son of Man was close at hand. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the excitement in the public mind should have been prodigious, and that crowds should have flocked even to the early morning services, to witness for themselves these strange phenomena.

Mrs. Oliphant has truly said :—

‘A concourse of a thousand people drawn together at half-past six in those black wintry mornings, with the November fogs rolling up from the unseen river and murky heart of the City, and day but faintly breaking through the yellow suffocating vapours, when the assembly dispersed, was a prodigy such as perhaps London never saw before, nor is likely to see again.’

What might have been the effect on a later generation familiarised with ‘Ecstaticas’ and ‘Adoloratas,’ with apparitions at Lourdes and La Salette, with mesmeric séances and spiritualist manifestations, with Mormonite miracles and Shaker communities, with American camp-meetings and Irish revivals, not forgetting the Italian S. David and his twelve Apostles, it is vain to speculate. Suffice it to say, that in 1831, in a less *blasé* age, the manifestations in Mr. Irving’s church not only occasioned immense excitement at the time, but were productive of lasting and momentous consequences. From them we may date the origin of the singular body which arrogates to itself the title of Catholic Apostolic Church, but is popularly known as Irvingite, though repudiating this name or any notion of spiritual descent from the Scotch Presbyterian Church to which Irving belonged.

‘There is no pretence,’ they say, ‘for the assertion that Mr. Irving was the author, founder, or director of the system, or was ever acknowledged as the ruler of those connected with it.’ And certainly there is much to be said in favour of their view. It requires a great stretch of imagination to conceive the process by which the gorgeous ritual of the church in Gordon Square can have been developed out of a Presbyterian service. Irving himself would probably stand aghast, if he were to appear again on earth to witness it. While we

believe that but for the support which the movement derived from Edward Irving's reputation, eloquence, and powers of mind, the so-called Catholic Apostolic Church, if born at all, would never have reached maturity, it is no less true that Irving soon found that he had called into existence a spirit which he could not control, that his part was to obey, not to rule.

He was never himself called to the office of Apostle or even Prophet in the Church.

'Outside people imagined him the leader, by right of whose permission Prophets speak and Elders teach, but within, the scene is very different. Apostles and Prophets have patience with him when the light breaks slowly and painfully upon his troubled soul, and mastering all the prejudices of his life, all the impulses of his will, the martyr, into whose lingering agony nobody enters, still bends his head and obeys. His reason and his heart struggle against their views, but still he submits, always submits, bringing his lofty, sorrowful head under the yoke.'

Such is the touching picture which his biographer has drawn of Irving struggling to adapt strange vestments to his giant limbs. Nor is it less true that most of those who came to the front in the new movement were members of the Church of England. Irving's Scotch friends gradually dropped away. Only one of the Elders of the Church in Regent Square followed him to Newman Street. Of the original Apostles only three were Presbyterians, while two were in English orders. There are two other men who, with quite as much reason as Irving himself, may be looked upon as the founders of the Church which commonly bears his name, both of them members of the Church of England.

One of these was Henry Drummond (with whom, in the popular mind, the Irvingite body is almost identified), well known as the eloquent and eccentric M.P. for West Surrey. His pleasant abode at Albury Park, with its luxurious hospitality, was the *wilderness* to which the Church retired from the world. His social position and personal popularity gained a favourable hearing for their opinions, while his purse supplied the necessary funds. To his refined taste and artistic feeling, the Catholic Apostolic Church mainly owes its æsthetic development.

The other, John Bate Cardale, though less known to the outside world, probably exercised a still greater influence on the fortunes of the rising community, and did more to mould it into the form which it ultimately assumed. Mr. Cardale, a solicitor in London, who had been Mr. Irving's legal adviser

on his trial before the Presbytery, was the first called Apostle, and afterwards, as Apostle of England and Pillar-Apostle, continued till his death last year, at the age of seventy-four, to be the ruling spirit of the Church. His shrewd practical mind, and talent for organisation, were most valuable in building up its outward framework. His liturgical studies were no less so in the compilation of its ritual. The author of *Apostolic Lordship* describes him as a man of iron will and dominating character, who could brook no opposition, and relates how, at a council of the Apostles, when some difference of opinion had been manifested about a proposal which he had made, he took up his hat and said, 'Well, gentlemen, I leave you; when you see your way to assent to my proposition, you may send for me.' There can be no question but that, with a kind heart and attractive manner, he loved power, and could put down rebellion with a high hand, as he showed on more than one critical occasion. In the darkest hours of the fortunes of the Church to which he belonged, he was entitled to the praise 'of not having despaired of the republic.' It remains to be seen how the Church, of which (more especially since the death of all his colleagues but two) he has been the life and soul, will survive his loss.

We are quite ready, then, to allow, that in speaking of 'Irvingites,' we are speaking incorrectly. We employ the term only in conformity with common usage, and for want of a better, as we cannot, without surrendering a principle, concede to them that of the 'Catholic Apostolic Church.' Our object in calling attention to their past history and present position, after a lapse of nearly fifty years, is to raise this very question: Can they establish any valid claim to so high-sounding an appellation?

We approach the subject in no unfriendly spirit. There is much which attracts our sympathies in the Irvingite system. We willingly admit that they have been of service in calling attention to some forgotten or neglected truths. We can bear personal testimony to the earnest, self-devoted lives and Christian spirit of many of their members. As ecclesiologists, we naturally hail them as fellow-workers in the great revival of ecclesiastical art. We are at one in the belief that whatever is rich and beautiful finds its fitting place in the House of God, and that there are rich liturgical stores, both in the Eastern and Western Churches, from which we may with advantage draw. We admire their reverence for holy things, their devotion of a tenth of their income to religious purposes, their frequent services, their open

churches. As Catholic Churchmen, we cannot but rejoice in the prominent place given in their worship to the great Eucharistic Sacrifice, in their recognition of the importance of an authorised Apostolic ministry, in their yearning after Catholic unity. But when all this is said, with so much that is beautiful in theory, what do we find in practice? What, after nearly fifty years, has been the result, but that another sect has been added to the 150 already recognised by the Registrar-General; that another rent has been made in the robe of Christ?

We have said that hitherto the members of the Irvingite community have been honourably distinguished from other modern sects, notably the Plymouth Brethren, by their Catholic and Christian spirit, but we fear that a change is coming over them in this respect, perhaps as the natural consequence of disappointed expectation. We are told that in some quarters more of a narrow proselytising temper is springing up, and that they are adopting the tactics of the Romanists, in endeavouring to make clergymen of the Church of England dissatisfied with their position, by exaggerating all its defects and anomalies, and putting forward the claims of their own body to be the one ark of safety.

It is this conviction which has led to the work whose title stands at the head of our article; but Mr. Miller shall speak for himself as to his reason for publishing an examination of the claims of the so-called Catholic Apostolic Church to a divine mission:—

‘I have known clergymen younger than myself, whom I have regarded as men with a great promise of doing good in the Church of Christ, admit their demands.

‘They have appeared to me, therefore, to require a careful examination at the hands of some one. And I have further thought that if the materials for forming a right judgment were collected into a convenient compass and made public, much good must of necessity ensue under the good Providence of Almighty God. Moreover, having myself made a careful examination by reading everything I could find anywhere, and by inquiry at head-quarters, and having become convinced that many good persons have been mistaken or deceived by a plausibility which some of the arguments put forward wear at first sight, I am anxious, with the Divine blessing, to strip off this plausibility, and by exhibiting the system in its true light, to win back, if possible, many souls to the Catholic Church of Christ, who have inadvertently been led into a positive schism.

‘Therefore, I have attempted to speak with all the fairness, and candour, and openness, that I can command, and to examine every single allegation that I can discuss. Whether this be right or wrong,

others will judge, nay rather He especially, whose guidance and blessing have been continually invoked throughout.'

We feel bound to say, after a careful study of Mr. Miller's book, that we think he has done good service to the cause of truth by the able and impartial manner in which he has executed his task. We had ourselves previously, by an independent course of reading and inquiry, and with access to other very important sources of information, arrived, in almost all respects, at identical conclusions, and we can endorse the accuracy of Mr. Miller's statements of fact.

It will be impossible within the limits of an article to give an account of the rise and progress of the Irvingites, or of the gradual development of their ritual, nor can we enter into a detailed investigation of their doctrines. For all this we must refer our readers to Mr. Miller's volumes.¹ What we

¹ It may be convenient here to give a brief summary of some of the principal events.

On May 2, 1832, sentence of expulsion was pronounced on Irving by the Presbytery of London, partly on a charge of heretical doctrine, partly on account of the manifestations which he had allowed in his church, and on the following Sunday the doors of his church in Regent Square were closed against him by the trustees. For a time his adherents found a refuge in a room in Gray's Inn Road, where Robert Owen had been used to lecture. Soon they removed to a more commodious building in Newman Street, which was opened on October 24, 1832, as the first Irvingite Church, and continued to be their head-quarters till the dedication of the magnificent edifice in Gordon Square on Christmas Eve, 1853. A few days after the first service in Newman Street, Mr. Cardale was called to be an Apostle, eleven months afterwards Mr. Drummond. Two more Apostles were called before the close of that year, and again two more in the course of the next, before the death of Mr. Irving. July 14, 1835, when the 1260 days, of which Mr. Baxter had spoken, would be completed, was appointed for the filling up of the number to twelve, and the formal 'separation' of the whole. Early in 1838, after two and a half years of preparation, chiefly spent at Albury, the Apostles went forth on their mission to the Tribes; in June, 1840, they were recalled, to put down a rebellion of the Prophet and Angels, when Mr. Mackenzie retired.

The following is a list of the Apostles, and of the 'districts' to which they were called, answering to the twelve tribes of Israel:

John Bate Cardale, Esq.	England and Wales.	Judah.
Henry Drummond, Esq.	Switzerland and Scotland.	Benjamin.
John Tudor, Esq.	India and Poland.	Ephraim.
Spencer Percival, Esq.	Italy.	Manasseh.
Rev. John Armstrong.	Ireland and Greece.	Zebulon.
Rev. H. Dalton.	France.	Asher.
Francis Sitwell, Esq.	Spain and Portugal.	Naphthali.
William King Church, Esq.	Denmark and Holland.	Issachar.
Thomas Carlyle, Esq.	North Germany.	Simeon.
Francis V. Woodhouse, Esq.	Austria.	Reuben.
Rev. W. Dow.	Russia.	Dan.
David Dow, Esq.	Norway and Sweden.	Gad.

propose to ourselves is to examine the evidence on which a body, claiming to be the Catholic Apostolic Church, and as such entitled to the obedience of all baptized Christians, rests that claim. They profess to believe that in these latter days, in preparation for the second advent of our Lord, there has been a fresh outpouring of the Spirit, as on the day of Pentecost, accompanied with a revival of the miraculous gifts of speaking with tongues, and prophesying and healing; that there has thus been a new revelation of God's will, in obedience to which they have been led to the restoration of the Apostolate, and a new organisation of the Church. Their theory, in its later development, is substantially this. They assert that on the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit descended *not* upon the Church generally, but on the Apostles *alone*. 'They were the link between Him in the heavens and His body on the earth.' 'When therefore the original Apostles were removed, the link being snapped by the loss of Apostles, the Church fell as a dead thing to the ground.' 'The ministry of the Apostles to the Church being interrupted, she drifted away from Christ.' The original plan of the Church provided for a Gentile Apostleship of twelve, to be added to the Jewish College of twelve. This is signified by the twenty-four elders on twenty-four seats, seen in vision, by S. John, Rev. iv. 4. Accordingly Paul and Barnabas were called and separated, but owing to the want of faith in the Church, God's purpose was changed. No more Apostles were then appointed. But now, after centuries, during which the Church has been in a maimed and mutilated state, the Lord, in preparation for His second coming, which is close at hand, has called and separated His Gentile Apostles to prepare the Church for His approach, and present it when He arrives.

'We can never,' says Mr. Drummond, 'be truly guided in His ways, never can be prepared to be caught up to meet the Lord in the air; never can be baptized with the Holy Ghost; never can be saved from the great destruction that is coming; never can be filled with all the truth of God, but by Apostles, as the spiritual instruments of God, and the means by which He will give us these blessings.'

So again, in an authorised document we read:—

'Christian men have always possessed, in the sacraments and pastoral ministry, those means of grace and guidance, without which

When Mr. D. Dow declined the office, Mr. D. Mackenzie was put into his place.

The seven Prophets admitted to Council at first were, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Cardale, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Bayford, Lady H. Drummond, Mrs. Cardale, Miss Cardale, of whom two were also Apostles.

they could scarcely be saved; but it is no less certain, and Scripture asserts it, that no lesser ministry than Apostles can prepare the Church for Christ's second advent, and present her a chaste virgin to the Lord.'

Whether, according to their present views, any other ministry, though sufficient in time past, is *now* valid, seems doubtful, since though at first episcopal orders were recognised, yet when afterwards the question was raised in council, *the word came*—

'Know ye that no man in the Church of God who is called a Minister, and hath not received the call of the Lord by a Prophet, and been separated to the ministry by an Apostle, is called and ordained of the Lord.'—*Council of the Churches*, Aug. 6, 1839.

On this as on many other points a good deal of reserve is practised, but be this as it may, it is manifest that the whole question turns on this assumption of a restored Apostolate, or rather new Gentile Apostolate. If they are right in their view, and all other authority in the Church is thus superseded, then we may concede their claim to be the Catholic Apostolic Church. If not, they have violated Catholic unity, they are guilty of schism, they have taken to themselves offices to which they have no call. This they themselves would allow.

'They justify their meeting in separate congregations from the charge of schism, on the ground of the same being permitted and authorised by an ordinance of paramount authority, which they believe God has restored for the benefit of the whole Church.' 'We admit that if God hath not spoken to us by Prophets, nor restored to us Apostles, then, however free from intentional schism, still we are found in the flagrant commission of schism.'¹

This, then, being the key of the whole position, we proceed to examine how they defend it.

We will not enter into the questions, whether, *a priori*, there was any ground for expecting such a revived apostleship, or whether the verse in the 1 Cor. xii. 28, on which they base their theory of a *fourfold ministry*, 'Some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers,' will bear this strain, or whether their view of the nature of tongues is correct. These points are very ably treated by Mr. Miller. We will confine ourselves to the simple matter-of-fact inquiry: How are we to know that God has restored Apostles to His Church? Granted, for argument sake, that Apostles were to be restored, how are we to recognise Mr.

¹ *Discourses delivered in the Catholic Apostolic Church, Gordon Square.*

Cardale and his friends as those Apostles? What credentials have they to show? What signs of apostleship?

They again and again insist that the peculiar distinction of the Apostle, his differentia, so to speak, is that *he is not of man, nor by man, but of God*, appointed immediately by God. But when again we inquire how we are to know that they are of God?—are we to take it on the simple *ipse dixit* of each? 'I believe myself to be an Apostle, therefore I am, and you are to receive me as such'—we are told that, besides an inward conviction, they were *called of God* through the *voice of Prophets*. So there appears, after all, something of human intermediate agency. We go on to inquire who are these Prophets? How do we know that God speaks through them? What are *their* credentials? We are told that the Pentecostal gifts have been revived in them, that by the Spirit they are enabled 'to speak with tongues and prophesy.' It becomes, then, very important that we should carefully sift the evidence for these so-called miraculous gifts. We fear that by such an inquiry we may cause pain to many who honestly and conscientiously believe that God really declares His will through these men, and listen to them reverentially and submissively as to a voice from God. But, even at the risk of doing so, we believe that we may be rendering a service to many who have been attracted by the lofty claims of the Catholic Apostolic Church without examining for themselves the foundation on which the fabric rests, if we endeavour to show how very slender that foundation is.

In our examination into the real character of this gift of tongues and prophecy we will take the evidence, not of opponents, but of those who would naturally be thought prejudiced in their favour, and we shall also avail ourselves of their own admissions.

All are agreed that the earliest manifestation of these gifts occurred in Scotland more than a year before the time of which we are speaking, in the person of Mary Campbell, a young woman of humble station, residing in the parish of the Rev. Robert Story, of Rosneath, and in the neighbourhood of the Rev. R. Campbell, of Row, whose deposition by the Presbytery, confirmed by the General Assembly, on account of his preaching truths which they called heresy, had caused great stir and excitement in the minds of men throughout the whole countryside. We read in the *Memoirs of Rev. R. Story*, to which we must refer for fuller particulars, that—
'Mary, on a Sunday evening, in the presence of a few friends, began to utter sounds to them incomprehensible, and believed by her

to be a tongue such as might have been spoken on the day of Pentecost. She desired to ascertain what the tongue was, in order that she might, when strengthened to do so, repair to the country where it was intelligible, and there begin her long-contemplated labours as a missionary to the heathen.

'By-and-by she announced that she believed it to be the language of a group of islands in the South Pacific Ocean, but as nobody knew the speech of the islanders, it was impossible to refute or controvert her assertion.'

The characters which she afterwards wrote down of the unknown tongue were furnished to Dr. Chalmers at his request, and by him submitted to Sir G. Stanton and Dr. Lee, who gave an opinion in which Sir G. Stanton agreed 'that it contained neither character nor language known in any region under the sun.' Mr. Story, at that time, was not indisposed to recognise the utterance as a real spiritual gift. He says :—

'The individuals who testify are very holy persons. Should the gift be conclusively ascertained, I see only for my part what would be in perfect accordance with the past manifestations of God's power. Ever since Mary Campbell became a Christian her desire has been to make known the Gospel. . . .

'But I feel that I am called upon to be especially jealous in my scrutiny, seeing that it involves such weighty and important consequences.'

Before stating to what conclusion Mr. Story subsequently came, we must explain that shortly after her first utterance Mary had been raised, as she declared, miraculously from a sick bed. A voice had bidden her arise and go forth and evangelize the heathen, or she and her father's house would be destroyed, and that speedily. She had, however, not gone forth, but married Mr. Caird, and with him, after staying some time at Bampton, had become the guest of Mr. Drummond at Albury. As Mrs. Caird she took a prominent part in the early utterances in Mr. Irving's congregation. Mr. Story had written to her, reminding her of the voice she had heard, and telling her that if it was from God she was bound to obey, and not act like Jonah, but all to no effect.

The following letter was written to Irving shortly before his death in 1834, after an interview in which he had pleaded earnestly with Story to enter into the ark of safety, *i.e.* the Irvingite community :—

'Oh, my beloved brother, what in this whole matter has given me so much pain is the infallible proof I have received of the back-sliding of one whom I so confidently set forth to the Church as possessed of a like spirit with her departed sister' (Isabella Campbell, of whom he had published a Memoir).

'From the time she conceived that she had become the recipient of supernatural powers she lost much of what I had witnessed in her of the mind of Christ. The simplicity was no more, and the love of display which was natural to her from her childhood was visibly, but I doubt not, unconsciously to herself, an element in all her sayings and doings.

'I state to you mere outlines, that might be filled up with particulars, which would show you what a troubled sea of uncertainties my mind must have been doomed to walk upon had I admitted Mary's claim to inspiration. . . . I feel I have greatly sinned in not having given publicly to the Church a faithful narrative of the beginning of these things, but a tenderness towards Mary herself prevented me.

'This was the first of all those cases which within the last five years have led many to think that the Holy Ghost is again with power in the midst of the Church. By most, if not by all, who so believe, her case is considered the most remarkable and conclusive. To me, who know it better than any other human being, it is an unchangeable stumbling-block which I could get over only at the cost of all the powers of moral and spiritual discernment by which I can know the things of God at all.

'You know what occurred afterwards. She was in the midst of those tumultuous meetings in Port Glasgow, receiving the homage of all classes of those religionists who were panting after novelties.

'I attempted from time to time to rescue her from such a perilous fellowship, and at last after much ado I succeeded in prevailing on her to live for some time away from excitement in the loneliness and quiet of the cottage at Mamore. Then, when away from those blasphemous scenes, where such gross familiarity was dared with the name of the Eternal, she came to herself, and confessed that she had spoken and prophesied in the name of the Lord Almighty when only giving vent to her own fancies.¹

'I take for granted that it was from Mary that Mr. Drummond received those notices respecting Isabella and the Johnstons, which his account of the rise of the Church at Albury contains. The *halo* round Isabella's head is a *pure fiction*. Mrs. Johnston denies entirely the statements respecting her husband and sister. Oh, my beloved brother, do you not hesitate before you admit such things are possessed of Divine authority? Are there in the Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke, such exaggerations as in Mr. Drummond's account of transactions which he would represent as being equally important? What an awful compromise of truth there must be, and what guilt does it involve, gravely and as by *Apostolical authority* to give for infallible statements the false glosses of an excited and imaginative girl.'

¹ At an earlier period she had written to Mr. Story, 'I had, before receiving your letters, come to the resolution to write to you and confess my sin and error for calling my own impressions the voice of God. Oh, it is no light thing to use that Holy Name irreverently, as I have been made to feel.'

This is the deliberate judgment of one who at first was inclined to look unsuspectingly on the imagined spiritual gifts, and to believe that the signs of the latter days, of which Joel had spoken, might be expected to appear once more :—of one intimately acquainted with all the facts from the beginning—one who, as his letter shows, would gladly, out of affection for Mary Campbell, have kept back the truth, if he had deemed it consistent with his duty to the Church of God. Surely such a letter from such a man ought in itself to carry conviction to an unbiassed mind.¹ But we will adduce another witness, the Rev. A. Scott—a man of great ability, chosen by Irving to be his assistant minister in London, of whom he says, ‘Sandy Scott is a most precious youth, the finest and the strongest faculty for pure theology I have yet met with.’ He seems to have exercised great influence over Irving’s opinions, and to have led him to share his own conviction that, ‘the miraculous gifts so largely bestowed upon the Apostolic age were not exceptional, but part of the inheritance of the Church in all ages.’ He had himself visited Mary Campbell, and it was because of conversations with him, that she was first led to think of the bestowal of spiritual gifts as possible, and to pray for them in her own person.

Mr. Scott then, if any man, might have been expected to look with favour on the supposed gift of tongues, but what was the case? Much to Irving’s distress, he too stood aloof after due examination of the facts, and wholly refused his sanction to the utterances of Mrs. Caird and others. Nor was he a man likely to be influenced by any fear of consequences, for, like Irving, he had been expelled from the Scotch Church for his rebellion against the stern Calvinism of the Westminster Confession. Surely his opinion is too weighty to be lightly set aside. Mr. Campbell, too, had come to the same conclusion. We dwell the more on this case, not only because it was the first, and considered by almost all, as Mr. Story says, *the most remarkable and conclusive*, but because unquestionably it was the hearing of the utterances at Fernicarry which led Irving and others in London to call prayer-meetings to seek for the revival of the gifts of the Holy Ghost in the Church. These began in October, 1830, after the return of a deputation, consisting of Mr. Cardale and two other gentlemen who had been sent to Scotland to examine into the supposed manifestations, and had satisfied themselves of

¹ It is important also incidentally as showing how little dependence is to be placed on the account of Irvingite miracles.

their reality ; but the first 'utterance' in London was not till April 30, 1831, when Mrs. Cardale, at a private meeting, spoke in a tongue and prophesied. Just at this time, Mrs. Caird arrived in London, as Irving's guest, and when the manifestations began in his congregation, was one of those who took a prominent part, as appears from the evidence given on Irving's trial before the London Presbytery. Without doubt, then, Mary Campbell (Mrs. Caird) was the 'fons et origo' of the gift of tongues, and the estimate we form of her must very materially influence our view of the whole question.

Another name brought forward on Irving's trial as a chief actor was that of Miss Hall, a governess in the family of Mr. Percival, afterwards an Apostle. She it was who rebuked Mr. Irving for endeavouring to suppress the voice of the Lord, when first heard at his midday service (it had previously been confined to the early morning), reminding him that 'Jesus hid not His face from shame and spitting.' Miss Hall subsequently declared that she had (all the time) been acting under a delusion, and withdrew entirely from the Irvingite communion, or, as they termed it, fell away. She admitted, too, that in two or three instances she had meditated utterances before delivering them.

But the most remarkable figure in these strange scenes, though only for a short period, was that of Mr. R. Baxter of Doncaster, who had previously been known to Irving. Coming up to London at this time on business, he heard Mr. Taplin and Miss Cardale speak in the tongue, and himself caught the infection, and prophesied 'with so much power and authority, and in so commanding a tone, that he soon took the lead, and was acknowledged by all as a gifted prophet, and more than a prophet.' His speedy appointment as an Apostle was predicted and looked for confidently. In January, 1832, Irving wrote of him with enthusiasm : 'The Lord hath anointed Baxter after another kind : I think the apostolical.' He spoke much 'in the power' and delivered many prophecies which were accepted without hesitation ; amongst others, 'that in 1,260 days from January 14, 1832, the Lord Jesus would come again in glory, the living saints be caught up to meet Him, and the dead saints raised.' But the point to which we would especially direct attention is this : that to Baxter is due the idea of the revival of the Apostolic order, which afterwards became the fundamental article of the Irvingite creed ; not merely the revival of gifts such as those bestowed on the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, but of a new order of ministry superseding all others. It was from

Baxter that the prediction came that 'the present appointment for ordaining ministers by the laying on of hands by the Church was cut short in judgment, and that God Himself was about to set forth by the Spirit a spiritual ministry.' From this time Irving and others began to pray, 'Give us Apostles.'

Not many months, however, passed, before Baxter's eyes were opened, mainly by the non-fulfilment of the prophecies which he had so confidently delivered. After many painful struggles he was satisfied that he had been under a delusion, and came up to London, just at the time of Irving's trial, to acknowledge the total downfall of his pretensions, and tell Irving and Cardale, 'we have all been speaking by a lying spirit and not by the Spirit of God.' We may well imagine what a blow this was to his former associates, more especially when he proceeded to publish a narrative of his connexion with the society and reasons for quitting it. Nevertheless, it does not appear in any way to have shaken their belief in the truth of the revelation of God's purpose supposed to have been made to him.

We come to another of the chief actors. The first to speak in an unknown tongue in Mr. Irving's congregation—the first *man* to speak at all—was Mr. Taplin. He is described as breaking forth suddenly in a voice which seemed like a crash, powerful enough to bring down the roof. Dr. McNeile, afterwards Dean of Ripon, was Vicar of Albury up to 1836. He had taken a prominent part in the prophetic conferences there, and had proposed a resolution:—

'That it is our duty to pray for the revival of the gifts manifested in the primitive Church, which are wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, kinds of tongues, and interpretations of tongues, and that a responsibility lies on us to inquire into the state of those gifts said to be now present in the West of Scotland.'

He may, therefore, fairly be considered as an unprejudiced witness. Now what is his testimony?—

'I heard Mr. Taplin, and what I heard was this. I write it in all seriousness before God, without scoff, sneer, or ridicule, but simply as a *bonâ fide* description of what I heard. It was neither more nor less than what is commonly called jargon, uttered *ore rotundo* and mingled with Latin words, among which I heard more than once, *Amamini amaminor*.'

It may here be observed that Mr. Taplin had previously kept an academy in Castle Street, Holborn. All the speci-

mens which have been given of the unknown tongue show it to have been simply gibberish. But the tongue, we are told, was merely calculated to draw attention to the utterances which followed in a known language. What means, then, have we of testing the value of Mr. Taplin's prophetic utterances? The importance of this is manifest if we bear in mind the very influential part which Mr. Taplin played in the Body. He was the first to be formally ordained to the office of Prophet, and was afterwards Pillar-Prophet. Five, at least, of the Apostles, if not Mr. Cardale himself,¹ were called by the Spirit speaking through Mr. Taplin. The *Records of the Council* show that nearly all of the important developments, both of doctrine and discipline, in the Church, and very much of the mystical exposition of the Old Testament Scriptures, were due to his utterances.² So influential was his position that it was allowed by a great authority, 'If there is anything wrong with Taplin, all is wrong.' Up to his death, in 1862, he continued to be a chief source of *light* to the Church. We might have supposed that so 'gifted' a

¹ Mr. Baxter, in his narrative, states that Mr. Cardale, the first Apostle, was called through Mr. Taplin. This, Mr. Cardale, in his *Letter on certain Statements in the Old Church Porch*, denies, but he carefully avoids saying through whom he was called. It seems to indicate a consciousness of weakness that a transaction of such vital importance to the Church should be left shrouded in mystery. We believe the facts to be these: 'The first call came through a 'handmaid,' Harriet Ray, a female servant. When there was some hesitation as to acting on this, utterances came from others, amongst whom were a clerk in Mr. Cardale's office, and Mr. Taplin. There is no record of that early date to appeal to, in confirmation of our statement, but it derives much support from Mr. Cardale's words (*Letter*, pp. 18-36)—'No person was received as being called to the apostleship in consequence of words of prophecy spoken *solely* through a woman.' On this call virtually hangs the truth or falsehood of the restored apostolate.

² The first definite step in schism was taken at Albury, under Mr. Taplin's direction, when Mr. M'Neile, the clergyman of the parish, refused to take part with the Irvingites. They at first acknowledged their 'defective and wrong condition in assembling apart from their appointed pastor.' Even when a Prophet had named Mr. Drummond Pastor of Albury, doubts were entertained as to the validity of the appointment without any outward ordination, and more especially as to the authority to celebrate the Lord's Supper. But at a meeting for prayer on December 26th, the Lord spoke through Mr. Taplin, a long time, in a tongue, and then said, 'The Lord ordains you, who have been called to be Angel of this Church, to feed this people with the Body and Blood of the Lord.' Afterwards the Spirit spoke again, with great power, through Mr. Taplin to Mr. Cardale: 'The Lord commandeth you, who have been called to be an Apostle, to lay hands on the Angel of this Church, and ordain him to rule this people, to feed them with the Body and Blood of the Lord.' All scruples were thus overborne. The authorised ministry of God's Word and Sacraments was set aside.

person was above all suspicion of being under evil influences ; but what do we find ? ' On one occasion,' we are told by Mr. Baxter, ' Mr. Taplin, having, in the voice of prophecy, rebuked Mr. Irving, was himself rebuked by the 'utterance' from Miss E. Cardale, and after some days confessed that " he had spoken this rebuke by the power of an evil spirit." '

Subsequently, in the congregation in Gray's Inn Road, Miss Cardale ' in the power ' declared that ' a gross sin had been committed against the Lord, and exhorted to confession.' Mr. Taplin, after some delay, came forward, and confessed that he had been guilty of speaking his own mind and mingling his own thoughts with the utterances.'

Again, in the course of 1834, while Mr. Cardale was absent, Mr. Taplin (and, observe, *after* his formal ordination as Prophet) delivered an 'utterance,' that the tabernacle of the Lord should be pitched. This was uttered over and over again, with some variation, for about a month, when he further said, that ' the sixty pillars of the tabernacle should be sixty ministers.' Accordingly sixty were chosen, and on the next Sunday arranged in their places. All thought that the tabernacle of the Lord would really soon be pitched, and that the glory of the Lord would enter it. Irving preached on the occasion, encouraging this expectation. But, in the course of the next week, a letter came from Mr. Cardale, in his apostolic office, rebuking both Irving and Taplin, ' who had,' he said, '*been deluded ; the whole being a suggestion of Satan.*'

The question naturally arises—If, on these occasions, and others that might be mentioned, Mr. Taplin was under a delusion, or spoke his own mind and not that of the Spirit, might it not also have been so when he called men to be Apostles or Angels ? Might not this, too, have been a delusion of Satan ? And if this call was not of God, does not the whole foundation on which the fabric is raised, crumble away ?

At a later period, the Apostles claimed the right to control prophecy, and to decide which utterances were of Satan, and which of God. But, even granting this claim, who was to decide on the utterances by which they themselves were called to be Apostles ? Why was more weight to attach to them than to that, for instance, by which Mr. Baxter had previously been called to be an Apostle ? With so much uncertainty whether any particular utterances were of Satan or God, so much opposition between Prophets, is not ' the voice of prophecy ' a most insecure basis on which to raise so mighty a superstructure as that of a Catholic Apostolic Church with its fourfold ministry ?

We have examined the evidence respecting four of those who were most conspicuous amongst the prophets in the early days of the Irvingite movement, and to whom in a very great degree the organisation and doctrines of the Church may be attributed. What is the conclusion which we must come to as to the real character of the so-called spiritual gifts? Must not every reasonable man allow that, when we find some confessing that they had been under delusion or had spoken out of their own minds, there is, to say the least, very insufficient ground for warranting the belief that through them God has seen fit to bring about an entirely new order of things in His Church?

But we have further to show how entirely events have falsified their predictions.

Again and again a day has been confidently fixed for the coming of the Lord, from that named by Mr. Baxter, July 14, 1835, down to July 14, 1876, when we are told eight hundred communicants assembled in Gordon Square Church in expectation of that great event.

Mr. Baxter's narrative adduces a great number of instances in which prophecies, confidently delivered and unhesitatingly received as coming from God, signally failed, or could only, by the most ingenious explaining away of their obvious meaning, be supposed to be fulfilled; and even if some of these have been substantiated in Mr. Cardale's answer, a sufficient number of instances remain untouched, to shew that the supposed voice of the Spirit was not to be relied on. It is not enough that out of many predictions one here and there should apparently come true. When everything is under the immediate direction of the Spirit, no failure can be allowed.

We shall not, we trust, be thought to be violating the sanctities of private life if we penetrate within the hallowed circle of Albury, and lift up the veil that shrouds it from the view of the uninitiated in order to adduce another instance of predictions falsified. Apostles and prophetesses, no less than emperors and queens, must be content to be looked upon as public characters.

The belief in the near approach of the second advent of our Lord naturally led to the expectation of the appearance of Elias who was to precede Him. The expectation was followed by an announcement that the birth of the prophet was to be looked for speedily, and, further, that the person selected for the high honour of being his mother was no other than the lady of the owner of Albury, herself a pro-

phetess, and then, like Elizabeth, well stricken in years. The prediction was received in unhesitating faith by the whole community, not least by the favoured mother.

The appointed time drew near: due preparations were made, more elaborate, we imagine, than those for the Baptist. The expectant mother has been described to us as lying in state on her bed, in an elaborate toilette, with lavender gloves, receiving the homage of her friends. The nurse was in attendance. The fashionable accoucheur of the day arrived from London, and then—(it is, perhaps, needless to say) the promised event did *not* come off. The doctor returned to London in his carriage, the nurse in a postchaise. The matter was hushed up, and little heard of, or remembered, beyond the inner circle of the faithful. The cradle, destined to receive the Prophet, still, however, remains. When the bubble burst, it was presented by Lady Harriet to a friend, and has since been occupied by many fair children who have come into the world in the course of nature without prophetic announcement.¹ Possibly, in a future age, when reverence for relics has been developed in the Church, it may figure in some sacred treasury, just as we are told there is to be seen in Spain the sword that Balaam *wished* for.

But it is not necessary to dwell on individual instances. The whole history of the Irvingites during the last forty-five years may be said to be a history of hopes disappointed, expectations deceived, predictions unfulfilled.

They were taught to expect Apostles on whom the baptism of fire had fallen, endued with all miraculous powers. They have been obliged to be content with men, few, if any, of whom possessed any supernatural gifts. The only sign of an Apostle to which most could lay claim was that of 'patience' (2 Cor. xii. 12.) One, after he became an Apostle, was known to pray, 'Lord, if I am an Apostle, where are the signs of my apostleship?'

They were taught to look forward to July 14, 1835, for the *separation* of the twelve who had already been called by the voice of God through His Prophets, but when the day arrived one of the twelve, Mr. David Dow, refused to come.

¹ While speaking of Albury we cannot withhold a second anecdote of the same lady, which comes to us from an unimpeachable source. It was announced that on a given day she would walk on the water, and the faithful were in attendance to witness the miracle. She was handed down to the lake by her footman, but failing to perform her part, had to be dragged again to land. It would require the pen of a Dickens, and the pencil of a Tenniel, to do full justice to the grotesqueness of 'Jeames' assisting at a miracle.

They were consoled by the thought that the analogy of their position to that of the original twelve was thereby confirmed, and a Matthias, Mr. Mackenzie, was chosen into the place of Judas. But after a few years Mr. Mackenzie too withdrew, 'feeling misgivings and doubts as to the power or right of Apostles to act as Apostles in any way whatever, until they had received a second Pentecostal endowment of power in supernatural manifestations,' which had been promised them so often, but had never come. Nothing could induce Mr. Mackenzie to change his determination. During the fifteen years that he lived afterwards, he never again took part in their services or held communication with them, though withheld by feelings of kindness from any public opposition.

This was the greatest blow that had yet befallen them. There had been before continued defections from their society of those who, on more intimate acquaintance with its working, had had their illusions dispelled;¹ but here was an Apostle not only withdrawing, but cutting away from them the very foundation of their faith by denying their right to be Apostles at all. And, not only so, but it struck at the root of another principle on which great stress had been laid—the Apostles' twelvefold unity. A word had come,—'If an Apostle says "No," ye have not the mind of the Lord. If a foundation be wanting, how shall the city be builded?' They were to be ruled by the voice of the 'twelve—the one.'

But there was yet another difficulty, which now for the first time must have occurred to them. It had been taught and received as a matter of faith that when the different nations had been parcelled out among the Apostles as their tribes, each was to seal 12,000, and thus the number of the 144,000 who were to stand before the Lamb was to be made up. It had of course been taken for granted that all the Apostles would remain until the coming of the Lord and present the elect before Him; but now one was lost, and ere long, as one after another of the Apostles was taken away, and yet the Lord came not, the question must again and again have arisen to trouble them. It was manifest too that in some of the tribes none at all had been sealed. (It is said that Mr. Tudor, to whom Poland and India had been assigned, never went to his tribe, 'not seeing an opening.') In others very few; even in England, where alone any considerable number had been sealed, it fell very far short of 12,000.

The only solution, we believe, that has been arrived at is

¹ e.g. Mr. Baxter, Mr. Marks, Mr. Grant, Mr. Pilkington, and Mr. Prior, all of whom published their reasons.

that the Apostles are to continue their work of sealing in Paradise,—an assertion which it is very difficult to refute, but which seems rather inconsistent with the belief that it is those who are *alive* and remain unto the coming of the Lord, who will be caught up to meet Him in the air.

The question must continually force itself upon them, and with increasing urgency every day, What is to become of the Catholic Apostolic Church if all the Apostles are removed before the coming of the Lord? If, as they say, the Church in the beginning 'fell as a dead thing to the ground,' when the original Apostles were removed, what must be the case with them? It is an essential part of their theory that Apostles can have no successors.

We have said nothing as yet of any support which the Prophets may derive from miraculous gifts, other than tongues, accompanying the outbreak of prophecy.

At first it was taken for granted that miracles would attend the outpouring of the Spirit, and miracles of healing were in fact claimed and advanced as a proof of the outburst of supernatural power in preparation for our Lord's advent. But as time has gone on, the appeal to miracles has been surrendered to such an extent that we find now carefully devised arguments put forward to show that miracles are not needed as credentials of these new teachers. Still it would not be right to put aside without inquiry the allegations made of miraculous cures in the earlier days of the movement; but there are two considerations of great weight:—

First, that there has been no sifting of the evidence on which these miraculous cures rest, and we have already seen, in the case of statements published by Mr. Drummond, on the faith of Mary Campbell, how essential such sifting is.

Far be it from us to put any limit to the power of prayer, or to deny the possibility of special interpositions of God, but when miracles are claimed in support of a new revelation it becomes our bounden duty to test their truth.

And, secondly, to use the words of Mr. Miller:—

'None of these so-called miracles are such as could not under peculiar circumstances be effected naturally without the intervention of any supernatural power. The influence of the mind over the body, especially in diseases of the nerves or spine which is the source of the nerves, and more particularly in females, is almost inconceivable to those who have not examined it. Accordingly, in religious minds, when the feelings are wrought up to a high pitch, the concentrated force of feeling and inspiration within has been often turned upon a diseased part, and an undoubted and surprising change has been worked, but all by causes strictly natural.'

Mr. Miller gives instances from his own experience or from medical testimony of the power of the mind in effecting cures of either a temporary or permanent nature. The whole chapter deserves attention, as also that in which he explains the physiological principles which may account for the tongues and prophetic utterances in persons of small self-control, strong emotions, and vivid imagination, especially if of an hysterical or epileptic tendency, under the influence of religious excitement.

But there is another claim put forward on behalf of the Irvingite Apostles, to which we must advert—"the grace given unto them." In other words, their adherents point, not only to the 'devotion and zeal of the members of the body which they have founded, but to their wisdom in managing it, the largeness of their catholicity, the compact and well-considered system of doctrine which they have consolidated and completed, the ingenious and perfect machinery of the different ministries, their elaborate ritual, and, most of all, to the liturgy which they have compiled,' as proofs that their original appointment was by no human agency, and that they have been acting under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit.

We are quite ready to admit that they have shewn great skill and wisdom in guiding their ship, that the framework of their Church is perhaps the most elaborate and ingenious piece of machinery ever introduced into a religious system, that their liturgy has many and great excellencies, though not without grave defects; but we cannot in all this see any evidence of superhuman agency, or anything to justify their high pretensions to be the direct channel of the influx of the Holy Spirit to the Church. We have before us the records of the 'Council of the Churches,' authenticated, in many cases, by the signatures of Mr. Drummond and Mr. Cardale. In these there are not only full minutes of the proceedings of the Council, and of the 'word from the Lord' spoken there, but there are also the words of prophecy uttered in the different Churches throughout the land and sent up by their respective Angels. We have studied these minutes very carefully, we have read very many of the '*ministries*' of the Apostles and '*words*' of the Prophets, so that we have some material for forming a judgment. Do we then find any evidence of superhuman wisdom or guidance? We answer, No.

The picture which these records present to us of the inner life of the Church is a very curious and interesting one, well worthy of study. All kinds of questions, touching doctrine, discipline, ritual, finance, come before the Council. Some are

dealt with in a sufficiently practical way—as when professors are engaged to translate the *Testimony* into German, Italian, and other languages, or a distinguished classical scholar is requested to revise the translation into Latin, but no allusion is made, as we might have expected, to the gift of tongues.

Sometimes we might fancy ourselves present at a meeting of the Ritual Commission, or Committee of Convocation on Rubrics, except that the voices of the Prophets break in from time to time, much after the manner of the chorus in a Greek play, and with something of their obscurity. Questions of finance, or trust deeds, are dealt with much as by ordinary mortals, even though the decisions are couched in Scriptural language. Occasionally the peculiar jargon of the Body, in which each of the officers is a ‘pillar,’ or ‘board,’ or ‘bar,’ or ‘pipe,’ takes us forcibly back to the days of childhood and the game of ‘family coach.’

But when we come to ‘ministries,’ or prophetic utterances, we find nothing to indicate inspiration, nothing even distinguished by force, or originality, or beauty of language. Many of them are mere echoes of Old Testament prophecies, and therefore retaining a certain grandeur of diction. Others are just such iterations of a few sentences as might be heard at any Methodist revival prayer-meeting. Some are almost unintelligible rhapsodies.

It is well known how important a place the symbolical interpretation of the Old Testament holds in their system. After the Apostles were ‘separated,’ they retired to Albury to study the Bible, and there the mystery of the tabernacle was set forth. We will give a specimen of symbolical teaching in its minuteness:—

‘Whilst reading Exodus xxiv. 23, concerning the table of shewbread, the Lord spake by His prophet Taplin as follows:—

“Ah! know the mystery of the number. Oh! the two cubits, the two cubits long. Is it not the measure of the breadth of a Pillar of Entrance? Ah! he leadeth to the table, he prepareth for the table.

“Oh! one cubit broad, ministered by one to the people, ministered by one hand. Oh! and the height, the breadth of a board. According to the faith (2) of the minister so shall the people feed (3).¹

“Ah! the measure of the Pillar of Entrance. He is of the height of the tent. He must be an Elder in the house of his God (2). Ah! the one cubit, the measure of the Altar of Incense. Let him minister who ministereth the incense. Let him minister the bread (2).

“Oh! for an entrance into the spiritual thing. Oh! for seeing the substance through the shadow. Oh! see ye the substance, the shadow

¹ The figures denote how often the sentence has been repeated.

shall pass away. Oh! for the beauty, oh! for the ornament, of spiritual discourse! Oh! for the crown round the table! Oh! the border of an handbreadth.

“Oh! ye Angels; ye have need of help, and ye have help at hand. Take ye a man; let him call to his elders for help. Ah! it is of an handbreadth. Oh! know ye the mystery of the hand? It is for help. Ah! they have hands under their wings; they have their helps of love (2).”

On another occasion, when the question was asked whether baptism should be celebrated during the service, the word came—

‘Know ye not that the laver standeth without the Holy Place?’

We will next give a few specimens of another kind (*Council of the Churches*, February 23, 1836):—

‘Mr. Drummond brought up the following burden from the Angel at Ware. How should an Angel have his child baptized? The word came through the Prophet Bligh:—

‘Ah! is not the altar two cubits high? Ah! doth not the Angel cease to be while he is being blessed.

‘Ah! let him be blessed by his help.’

‘Mr. Cardale called on Mr. Percival to give the discernment of that word, when the word came through Mr. Taplin:—

‘Ah! let it not be spoken. Oh! (tongue). Oh! ye prophets, know ye your border, for Satan layeth a snare for your feet (4). Oh! ye that have not the gift of opening the symbols which the Lord hath given, hold ye your peace.’

‘Whilst counsel was being given, the word came:—

‘Oh! Jesus ascended up on high; He led captivity captive, He received gifts for men (2). Oh! He gave men as gifts to His body (5), that He might dwell in the midst of them.

‘Oh! ye Apostles; ye are Apostles wherever ye go. Ye stand in your ministries; ye are the gift. Oh! ye Prophets, ye are Prophets wherever ye go. Ye stand in the ministry; ye are the gift (2). Oh! ye Evangelists, ye are Evangelists wherever ye are sent. Oh! it is in the men, for ye are the gift. And ye Pastors! Oh! ye are the gift, unto you is committed a ministry. Strengthen yourselves in it, for ye are the gift (2).

‘Oh! blessings descend from the head (2). Jesus ascended to receive them, and they descend from the head.

‘Oh! the rain descendeth upon the earth, and the earth yieldeth its increase. Blessings ascend not, they descend. Let the greater be blessed of the less. Oh! ye Apostles, wherever ye go bless ye the heads of the Church, for in them ye bless the Churches. Unto you is given help. Oh! ye have a blessing of the Lord yet in store. Ye shall have delegates. Ye shall have the archangels of God flying through the midst of heaven. Oh! seek ye for them! long ye for them! but commit not yourselves.’—(Taplin.)

‘After further counsel had been given by the Elders, the Apostles retired to consider of the judgment. On returning to the Council the Apostles gave judgment—

‘That the judgment of the Lord was, on the counsel given, that Mr. Elwell should throw the burden on the Apostles.’

Whether Mr. Elwell ever got an answer to his burden, or how the child was baptized, does not appear. But in sober seriousness we would ask—Was it for this that the Apostolate and supernatural gifts were restored to the Church?

Occasionally we find *burdens* dealt with in a more commonplace manner. For instance, Mr. Horn inquired whether a help who was an officer in the police, and who had had the offer of a situation as superintendent of the workhouse at Saffron Walden, might accept it. He received counsel—

‘That the help could not leave the service of the Lord to accept this offer, and, more especially, as he would become instrumental in the administration of a law (the Poor Law), against which the Lord had spoken with so strong a hand.’

‘Mr. Owen inquired whether it was the duty of the Church to require a licensed victualler to shut up his house on Sunday, the man being willing to obey any command given him? Counsel was given, and was gathered up by the Lord, who spake by an Apostle:—

‘It is vain for ye, ye Angels, to multiply laws for your fleshly churches. When your rule is spiritual, your obedience shall be in the spirit. Your burdens shall fall from you.’

The following entries will show how discipline was exercised.

It is well known that the Apostles, as time went on, found it more and more necessary to keep the Prophets in order, till at last, as the Prophets complained, they threw down the ladder by which they had climbed up.

‘An handmaiden beginning to prophesy during the ministry (*i.e.* preaching) of the Apostle Armstrong, the Lord spake by the Pillar of the Prophets (Taplin):—

‘*Secondarily* Prophets. “Speak not, thou Spirit, when an Apostle ministereth.”’

So again, in January 1837, Mr. Dalton having mentioned, that during his teaching in the Church he had been interrupted by Mr. Little, Mr. Cardale and Mr. Taplin were instructed to visit Mr. Little and report to the Council.

‘During the consideration of the matter the following word was spoken:—

‘Oh! ye have parleyed with evil. Oh! giving place to the Devil, ye ought to have hindered him in the beginning—Oh! in the infancy of his working—Oh! ye have parleyed with him.’

At the next meeting of the Council we find this resolution, that 'considering the discernment expressed by the Apostles yesterday as to the case of Mr. Little, founded on his words and conduct on January 10, and the words spoken through Mr. Drummond, "*Liar, detected liar, be silent.*" we determine that Mr. Little be informed that he cannot be permitted to speak until we have received conviction that the Devil has ceased to speak by him.'

'While Mr. Cardale was making his report the word came :—

'Oh ! before the Lord, into his very presence, with lying signs and wonders will the Devil come.

'Ah ! as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, ah ! so shall the enemy withstand, so shall he contend.'

On February 15, Mr. King reported 'that things were in training for the cleansing of Mr. Little,' but when Mr. Little was present on March 17, the word came—

'Oh ! be ye not defiled here. Let every evil thing be put away. Let not Satan, let not any evil spirit have an entrance here. Be ye warned.

'Whereupon Mr. Little was requested to withdraw.'

On April 1, we again find Mr. Little's case before the Council, and Mr. King, as Apostle in charge of the Church in Albury, reporting that 'there would be no obstacle to Mr. Little's being restored to the communion of the Church on the morning of the next day' (Sunday).

But on Monday, Mr. King again reported that 'early on Sunday morning Mr. Little was driven from his house by the power of the Devil, and thus the purpose of restoring him to communion was hindered,' and sought counsel. He was counselled that the Angel or his Help was to strengthen Mr. Little on the faith of what had been done on Friday, when the word of the Lord declared him pardoned, and absolution was pronounced upon him, and in hopes of his restoration.

On April 27, the Angel of the Church at Albury having expressed a wish to restore Mr. Little to communion, he was instructed,—

'That if he did not discern in what befel Mr. Little, after absolution, a recurrence of leprosy, he should stand in the faith of that absolution and receive Mr. Little to communion, taking heed not to give the communion to one under evil spiritual power.'

Mr. Little was accordingly publicly restored, and at a later period was appointed Angel of the Church at Ware. As a specimen of his utterances, which are frequently recorded, we may take this :

'The word came by Mr. Little.

'It is a very unusual thing : it is a very strange thing. It was this afternoon while lying on a sofa. The subject in detail cannot be given, but *the word in the power* was, There must be a change.'

Did this require *the power* to utter it? But it is gravely recorded as an inspired utterance—(*Records*, p. 829).

Our next extract is a longer one ; but it gives the interior history of a very important event in the history of the Church—the separation of the twelve Apostles—and may be taken as a very favourable specimen of prophetic utterance. Up to this time there had been but six Apostles, and these, though called, had not been 'separated' to their work ; but it will be seen that on June 10th, Mr. Drummond announced the appointment of two more, and on the 17th Mr. Taplin 'called' four others ; and the 14th July was fixed for the solemn separation. But the Rev. D. Dow, then at Dumfries, declined the appointment—Mr. Woodhouse and Mr. Sitwell were sent to reason with him, but to no purpose.

On the 14th, when this was ascertained, Dr. Thompson and Mr. Mackenzie were selected from among the Angels to be set before the Apostles, in the room of Mr. D. Dow (who seems, very *unjustly*, to have been considered a traitor like Judas), and of these, Mr. Mackenzie was called by Mr. Taplin, and accepted as the twelfth Apostle.

Council of the Churches, June 10th, 1835.—It was announced by Mr. Drummond, that after the last Council, at a meeting of the Apostles, the Lord had ordered that the four Pillars should be shown forth, and that Mr. Carlyle and Mr. W. Dow should take their seats as Apostles.

June 17.—After the blessing, the Lord spake by Mr. Taplin :—

'Oh ! the slowness to believe. Ah, that the Lord hath spoken. Oh ! the lack of your faith. Ah ! would He not bring forth Maz-zaroth in his season.

'Would He not number His Apostles? Would He not seal His chosen? He waiteth for your faith. He longeth for your faith.

'Ah ! He shall tell you His mind.

'Oh ! thou servant of the Lord, Cardale, thou first foundation, the Pillar in the midst of the Apostles, call thou them forth. Jesus would have them prepared. He would have them wait for His blessing : gather thou them.

'Ah ! go thou from Dumfries' (where Mr. Dow was) 'to the Lord's servant *Sitwell*. Tell him the Lord would have him here waiting upon Him, and bless thou his Church in the name of the Lord. Appoint thou a ruler. Come thou thence to Birmingham, let the Lord's servant *Dalton* come with thee also, and bless thou his Church. Haste thou in thy work.

'Oh! the Lord hasteth to bless His people : hinder Him not. Oh! and let the Lord's servant *Tudor* also come hither and wait upon his God. Ah! Jesus hath blessings for him. Oh! be ye not slow of heart to believe!

'Oh! haste thou in thy work—discern thou the time!' (7)

'Again the Lord spake by Mr. Taplin:—

'Oh! for the eye of faith: shall it not be given? Shall there not be a gathering? Let the Apostles be gathered, Oh! let them be gathered. Oh! the hindrance, the hindrance of the flesh. It hindereth the Lord in His purpose.

'And ye stars in the hand of Jesus, ye Seven, labour ye to enter into the purpose of the Lord; let not Satan in your flesh hinder.

'Ah! ye Seven. Jesus would separate his Apostles by you; He would commit them to the faith of the Church by you, that He might make them shine.

'Oh! let that Apostle (Cardale) hasten his work, let him gather the Twelve. Oh! the failing, the failing of the foundation. Oh! the failing in your faith. Did not Jesus commit him to your faith? Did He not commit him to your prayers, ye Angels of the Churches? . . . Oh! haste, to gather them. Ah! and thou Pillar of Angels, gather thou the Angels, gather thou the sons, all the sons of the morning. Discern thou the season, number the seven days before it, to wait upon the Lord. The perfect waiting; for Jesus will be inquired of; He will be wrought with; He will be laboured with; He will not labour alone.'

'Again, after supplication made,

'Oh! have ye seen it? Have ye seen it? the darkness of the pit, the outer darkness, the gnashing of teeth, the beating of the bosom, the eye lifted to the light but sealed in darkness: Oh! thou Apostle Drummond, write to thy brother at Oxford, and tell him to go and meet the Lord's servant and Apostle at Dumfries (Mr. D. Dow); let them carry together the commandment of the Lord. Shall not the ruby have fire in its bosom? fire of love!'

'Mr. Drummond, inquiring respecting the time the Lord had spoken of, the Lord spake again:—

'Oh! is not the fourteenth of the seventh the time? Have ye no faith? would ye let the word slip out of your heart? The fourteenth of the seventh! is it not the month coming?' (2)

'Inquiry being further made whether it was the lunar or calendar month, the word came:—

'She putteth the moon under her feet. Ah! the sun to rule the day. Clothed with the sun. Number ye not four?

'Ah! the Twelve, the Twelve Constellations of Heaven. Shall they not be brought forth? Shall they not be seen?'

'Again the word came:—

'Let all thy Angels come, let them be gathered, and the Lord shall give them discernment of Twelve. Have faith in the word. Oh! have faith in thy God.'

On July 11 we have the following record. Respecting the admission of Mr. David Dow, to whom Mr. Woodhouse and Mr. Sitwell had been sent by the word of the Lord, the Lord spake :—

‘Shall an unclean spirit be let into the house of your God?’

‘Again :—

‘Ah! ye Pillars, stand in your places.

‘Ye Angels! ye Seven! Stand in your places and ye shall have discernment. Ye servants of the living God, upon whom is the name of Apostle, ye are in the place of rule, look ye also unto the Lord, and ye shall have discernment.’

‘Again, by another :—

‘Ah! by the messengers whom the Lord hath sent may he come, and by no other.’

‘On July 13 Mr. Drummond inquired, as keeper of the Oracles, what he was to do if any word of the Lord had not been obeyed. The Lord spake :—

‘Ah! if it be not obeyed, bring the matter before the Council.’

‘Mr. Drummond then said that the word respecting the message to David Dow had not been obeyed, and that the two servants, Mr. Woodhouse and Mr. Sitwell, were not to take their seats until they had seen Mr. Dow. They proceeded to leave the Council in search of Mr. Dow, when the Lord spake by Mr. Taplin :—

‘Return not until thou hast seen him, and thou also who accompanied His servant, who is sent. Shall not the sun stand still? Thou Sun of the Firmament of Heaven, Jesus, stay thy course until thy servant is found.

‘And thou, Church, stay thy course until His servant be found. Oh! your enemies are strong, they are mighty. Oh! for the lifting up of the hand unto God that ye may prevail.’

‘During the intercession which was then made, the Lord spake :—

‘Oh! the betrayed one, the Lord Jesus, hath passed through the grief. Ah! shall He be crucified again?

‘Carry ye the burden of your Lord into your closets.

‘Carry ye the burden till ye are delivered.

‘Shall Jesus stand at the altar, and shall not His Angels stand with Him on the earth, pressing out their intercession that their brother may be saved, that his light may not be hid in darkness for ever?’

‘On the 14th, the day appointed (the fourteenth of the seventh) for the separating of the Apostles, at the morning sacrifice, the word of the Lord came at the close of the service :—

‘Oh! ye princes of Israel, Jesus again breaketh silence in your ear. Have ye considered the matter? Know ye not there is a tribe lacking this day in Israel? Would ye sit upon thrones judging the sealed ones of Israel? Know ye not that ye shall appear at the bar of your God, and your brother shall appear, and the faithful shall judge the faithless?

‘Go ye every one and plead ye with him. Ah! have ye the tears

of Jesus? Drop them before him. Oh! haste ye to fulfil your work. Let the Angels stay and intercede. Ah! ah, the Angels! let them plead and bring ye your brother. Command him to come into the Council of the Lord. Command him to come. Plead with him to come.'

'The Apostles departed in order to fulfil their mission, and the Angels continued in prayer until the time of the meeting of the Council, at twelve mid-day.'

(Mr. Dow had been found obdurate in his refusal to be an Apostle.)

'The Lord spake through Mr. Cardale :—

'Oh! ye Angels, think not the prayer hath not been heard; think not that Jesus hath not been with you. He hath pleaded, and He hath obtained. Ah! the counsel of your God shall stand.

'His purposes shall not fail. Man may fail; but the purposes of your God shall stand.

'His bishopric let another take. Ah! of those that have companied with Jesus from the beginning.'

'Through Mr. Taplin :—

'And let the Apostles choose, and the Lord shall give forth the lots.'

'Through Mr. Drummond :—

'Ah! ye Angels, hath your faith stood in your God? hath it stood in the purpose of your God?'

'Through another :—

'From the Angels who have been with us from the beginning let the Apostles choose, and the Lord shall give forth the lot. Shall He not choose His servant?'

'The Apostles withdrew, and during their absence the Lord spake by Mr. Taplin :—

'Oh! is it a wonderful thing in your eyes? (2) Oh! ye look at the creatures of a day. Ah! ye mind the things of a day (2). Ah! and therefore the counsel of the Almighty seemeth strange.'

'The Apostles returned, and a word of the Lord came by Mr. Taplin :—

'Call thou the servants of the Lord, framed before the Pillar of Apostles. Ah those whom ye have chosen.'

'Mr. Cardale called forward Mr. Mackenzie and Dr. Thompson. The word of the Lord came again by Mr. Taplin :—

'Ah! hath not Jesus chosen His servant? (2) He saw him in the beginning (2). He saw his faith. He saw he was a foundation in the beginning. Ah! ye Apostles have chosen (2).' (Tongue.) [Then going up to Dr. Thompson.] 'Oh! thou hast been very faithful. Oh! but thou hast a hindrance to thy work. Jesus commandeth thy faith, commandeth thy love; for through much darkness and danger hast thou followed Him. And He shall receive thee yet in His kingdom. Oh! envy not thy brother; he spareth thee suffering.' [Then going up to Mr. Mackenzie.] (Tongue.) 'Ah! Jesus chooseth thee; for thou art reckless in thy love; thou art reckless in

thy faith ; thou fearest not the face of a man that shall die. Oh ! thou hast been faithful, and Jesus chooseth thee. But a threefold cord is not quickly broken. Let the Angels choose whether of these servants shall choose the Lord. Let them stand in the presence of God (2) and give their assent.'

'The Angels all rose in assent. Through Mr. Cardale the word came :—

'Blessed be thou, servant of the Lord. Draw thou nigh and take thy place, and serve thou faithfully, as thou hast served. He taketh thee from thy charge from feeding the sheep. He giveth thee to his universal Church, an Apostle of Jesus.'

'Afterwards the word came by Mr. Cardale :

'Let the Angels at the evening sacrifice bless this brother in the name of the Lord.'

'At the evening sacrifice the Lord spake by Mr. Taplin (Tongue):

'Ah ! the Lord hath thundered out of heaven . . . Ah ! He hath triumphed (5). He hath His twelve (3). Oh ! behold ye the triumph of faith.'

'Oh ! invoke thou the presence of the Lord' (to Mr. Heath).

'Then turning round to the rest of the Angels :

'Ah ! ye lay on your hands in the seven on your brethren. Stand ye up assenting. Stand ye up rejoicing.'

'The seven Angels proceeding to obey the word, the Lord spake by Mr. Taplin :—

'Ah ! let the Apostles stand.'

'After hands had been laid on Mr. Percival :

'Oh ! it is the separating from the mother, yet of the mother. Oh ! ye cannot ascend to the throne, ye have to flee into the wilderness.'

'After hands had been laid on them all, the Lord spake by Mr. Cardale :

'Ah ! caught up, caught away. Oh ! the child of faith committed to the care of the Church !'

Those who have formed their judgment of Mr. Drummond from his anti-Popery harangues in the House of Commons, will perhaps be surprised at his report to the Council, on his return from abroad, in which he says :

'Every part of the ceremony of the Mass is replete with meaning to those who are well instructed, and therefore greatly conducive to devotional feelings.

'On a comparison of those who are seeking to serve God in the Papacy with those who are doing the same among the Evangelical sects, the result is vastly favourable to the former, especially in uprightness, moral integrity, absence of cant and boasting. Persons are to be found in France and Italy of the highest merit, whilst it would be difficult to point out any such amongst the Evangelical Protestants of France and Switzerland.'

One more extract we will give to show that Mr. Cardale,

when he could divest himself of the language of prophecy, could write vigorous, incisive English. It is part of a manifesto addressed by the Apostles to the Churches on August 4th, 1840, asserting their own authority, and declaring their intention no longer to seek counsel from the Council, having learned 'the state of men's minds, and especially the minds of the ministers of the seven churches in London :—

'Apostles are the ordinance for commandment, and to the words of Apostles Angels are to look, and they are not to expect to be satisfied, so as that they should claim to hear the words of prophecy giving light to Apostles.

'Apostles are the judges of the sufficiency as well as of the intent of those words of prophecy. They only are the discerners of those words of prophecy, and therefore none others can adjudicate on the question whether Apostles are acting in the light or not. And so with respect to the several ordinances for counsel given to Apostles. Apostles are the judges of the occasion when to seek counsel, and of the hearing of that counsel. They cannot bring the decision in any question whatever under the adjudication of others, whether or no counsel is to be sought, and whither it leads when given. And our brethren should remember that they are not to look to twelve men, nor to any other number of men, but to the ordinance of God for commandment and rule.

'The case is still stronger as to doctrine. . . . Apostles are the ordinance for doctrine. The doctrine of the Church is the doctrine delivered by Apostles, and all ministers are called to have faith in God, that the twelve Apostles will not deliver to them any doctrine, but that which is the doctrine of the Church, the expression of the eternal truth of God.'

With this high-handed assertion of Apostolic authority, we might say infallibility, we must conclude our extracts, and it is quite time to bring this article to a close. We revert to the question,—Who are these Apostles with such high pretensions? What are their credentials? They claim a call from God through *the voice of prophecy*. We have shown to what grave suspicion that call lies open, especially in the case of Mr. Cardale, the first Apostle, when, even according to their own admission, there was no one to discern between the voice of the Spirit and the voice of Satan. They appeal in vain to prophecies fulfilled or miracles performed in support of this claim. Has their success been sufficient to compensate for any defect in their title? Far from it. After forty-seven years they have gathered in not more than 10,000, and these not from the unbelieving world, but from those whom they acknowledge to have been believers before. Well may Mr. Miller say

that 'Failure is written in large letters over the Restored Apostolate.'

They themselves confess the failure and the disappointment of all their expectations.

Nor again can we find either in their teaching or their government of the Church anything to indicate superhuman wisdom or supernatural guidance. We have purposely abstained from the inquiry, how far their doctrines or their practices are conformable with Holy Scripture or with Catholic tradition; we have joined issue on the simple question,—Can they prove that they have been called of God to be Apostles? We think that we have shown that they cannot, and if so, then according to their own admission, '*that if God has not spoken by Prophets nor restored Apostles, then they are found in the flagrant commission of schism,*' we must come to the conclusion that instead of being the Catholic Apostolic Church, as they would have us believe, they are (though, we willingly allow, unintentionally) violators of Catholic unity, and nothing more than a schismatic body without any claim to an Apostolic ministry.

ART. III.—MR. BROWNING'S POEMS.

1. *The Poetical Works of Robert Browning.* 6 vols. (London, 1870.)
2. *The Ring and the Book.* By ROBERT BROWNING. 4 vols. (London, 1872.)
3. *Fifine at the Fair.* By ROBERT BROWNING. (London, 1872.)
4. *Red Cotton Nightcap Country.* By ROBERT BROWNING. (London, 1873.)
5. *Pacchiarotto and other Poems.* By ROBERT BROWNING. (London, 1876.)
6. *La Saisiaz: the Two Poets of Croisic.* By ROBERT BROWNING. (London, 1878.)

MR. BROWNING'S position as a poet is a peculiar one. In purely intellectual power he is, perhaps, greater than any English poet since Shakspeare; and combined with this he has almost universal sympathies, and a very wide range of knowledge. And yet his actual influence, even among those

who appreciate his poems, is not great. He stirs us up, he interests us, he compels our admiration; but his poetry is not, to any great extent, a guiding force in the intellectual life of the present day. One great cause of this want of influence is, we believe, that very intellectual power which is his distinguishing characteristic: or rather, it is the want of emotional force to balance the intellectual power. The truths which he sees, whether they be truths of the imagination or of observation only, are apprehended by the intellect, which analyses them, reasons from them, sets them in various lights, but fails to give them the *vivida vis* which is furnished by emotion penetrating and informing the results of intellectual power. Hence he is to a great extent lacking in persuasiveness, and the mind is even roused to antagonism by the subtle trains of reasoning in which he delights, and refuses to be convinced, though they may be logically correct. And as the subjects with which his intellect deals are chiefly old and much-debated problems, it is hardly to be expected that the actual answers which he gives to them can, in themselves, be of such originality as to form a new point of departure in thought. Rather we must look for his special teaching in the method he adopts, and in a few great principles which underlie most of his utterances.

Of course, the most obvious reason to give for Mr. Browning's want of influence is his peculiar style. But as regards the difficulty of his poems, there has surely been a good deal of exaggeration: and what is true in the accusation of obscurity is true not so much of the actual grammatical construction and language in which the poems are written, as of the sequence of the thoughts. The language is never as smooth, but is very often quite as intelligible as that of Mr. Tennyson's deeper poems, *In Memoriam*, for example; and in many of Mr. Browning's poems, the reader finds each thought expressed in English far more lucid and direct than the intricate and turbid verbiage of Mr. Swinburne's dithyrambs. It is not to be expected, however, that poetry, the great characteristic of which is intellect, the great want emotional force, should be as easy of comprehension at first sight as that which deals with the simple passions and feelings of the heart; and we believe, further, that one reason why Mr. Browning's obscurity is so generally noticed is, that in his case the difficulty is not to any great extent counterbalanced by the rhythmical power or the subtle grace which is often a substitute for intelligibility in poets like Mr. Swinburne or Mr. Tennyson. The reader has only the logical

meaning of the passage to deal with, there is no charm of melody to distract his attention, and therefore he is more alive to the obscurity in the expression of the thought.

But though the difficulty of Mr. Browning's language may have been exaggerated by the indolence and inattention of hasty readers who have not had patience to get accustomed to the style, there can be no doubt that in the construction of an argument, or even in the statement of a fact, he is frequently very obscure. The thoughts are connected by very subtle trains of reasoning, which are often, however, suppressed altogether: while the illustrations, sometimes very far-fetched, are introduced with startling abruptness, or with a prolixity which converts them into digressions of the most distracting nature. An objection or a question is stated, and the reader naturally expects an answer, which indeed is given, but proves to have little or no apparent connexion with the main question, but is a reply to some allusion or suggestion which has slipped in with very little warning. If we read, for example, in the Pope's monologue in *The Ring and the Book*, his answer to the objection supposed to be raised by Euripides: or trace the sequence of the thoughts in *Fifine at the Fair*, which is made up of apparent digressions, where the poet seems to go off at the suggestion of a chance word or phrase, the peculiar obscurity of Mr. Browning's writings will be manifest.

But in the difficulty of his style Mr. Browning is not alone; many great poets have found it impossible to express deep thoughts to the satisfaction of shallow readers. What is remarkable in him is the singular disregard of melody and of the beauty of rhythm; the total want of charm about the form of his poems is almost a unique phenomenon in art. For it is not, apparently, the common case of absolute inability to express melodiously thoughts in themselves highly poetical; for every now and then Mr. Browning gives us a short passage of almost perfect beauty of form, which makes his immediate relapse into harshness all the more tantalising. Two or three lines, such as those in 'Rudel to the Lady of Tripoli'—

'Oh, Angel of the East, one, one gold look
Across the waters to this twilight nook,
—The far sad waters, Angel, to this nook,'

or a short poem such as 'Love among the Ruins,' almost seem intended as proofs of his power over the form of verse, in spite of the many hundred lines which testify against it. And popular feeling, worthless as a test of other poetical qualities, but a sure judge of rhythm and 'swing,' has, by

its acceptance of Mr. Browning's stirring ballads and lyrics, while almost ignoring his greater efforts, borne witness to the real melody and power of which he is capable. We should rather hold the true explanation of the rough and crude expression of his thought to be, not his ignorance of the value of form, but his intense desire to grasp the matter, to penetrate to the innermost meaning of the facts with which he is dealing. In this, as in some other points, he resembles Mr. Carlyle. Neither is without a genuine appreciation of beauty, even of mere superficial beauty in form and expression; but this must be subordinated in both to the more important claims of truth. So Mr. Carlyle, though one of the very few living prose writers whose language can be something more than a mere means of expressing thought, is, as Mr. Lowell has said, 'regardless of the outward beauty of form, sometimes almost contemptuous of it;' and Mr. Browning, with a far higher appreciation of beauty, and very considerable power over the language, is content to be rough and harsh in his eagerness to press on to the real meaning and innermost truth of his subject. And this seems to go deeper than the mere form of his verse; it is a pervading characteristic of his mind. An ardent and cultivated musician, he refuses to stop, where so many musicians stop, at the outward form of music, but tries to penetrate to the meaning of it. Thus he analyses the message brought to him by an old Venetian 'Toccata of Galuppi's'—

'Oh Galuppi, Baldassaro, this is very sad to find!

I can hardly misconceive you; it would prove me deaf and blind;
But although I take your meaning, 'tis with such a heavy mind.

Here you come with your old music, and here's all the good it
brings.

What, they lived once thus at Venice where the merchants were
the kings:

Where S. Mark's is, where the Doges used to wed the sea with
rings'—

using the music to summon before him all the vanished scene of splendour and youth with the inevitable thought, suggested by it, that

'Some with lives that came to nothing, some with deeds as well undone,
Death stepped tacitly and took them where they never see the sun.'

So he addresses 'Master Hugues of Saxe-Gotha,' in a way which is common among unmusical people, who secretly wish to depreciate the art, but which real lovers of music generally avoid with some scorn:—

'Hist, but a word, fair and soft !
 Forth and be judged, Master Hugues !
 Answer the question I've put you so oft :
 What do you mean by your mountainous fugues ?'

And, above all, in 'Abt Vogler' he rises to the height of his imaginative power in describing the content of music—

'What never had been, was now ; what was, as it shall be anon ;
 And what is—shall I say, matched both ? for I was made perfect too.
 All through my keys that gave their sounds to a wish of my soul,
 All through my soul that praised as its wish flowed visibly forth,
 All through music and me.'

Nothing more strikingly exemplifies Mr. Browning's prevailing intellectuality, and his eager pursuit of truth, than these efforts of his to penetrate beyond the form in the art which to most people has no definite meaning, no essence whatever except form. He cannot be contented with the vague descriptions of beautiful sounds, with the unmeaning demonstrations of pleasure which usually pass for musical criticism ; he must find something for the intellect to grasp, though of course he would own, as indeed he does in *Fifine at the Fair*, that the content of music is not so much thought as feeling, that

'Thought hankers after speech, while no speech may evince
 Feeling like music.'

For this reason it is, of course, easier for him to find in the other branches of art a meaning on which his thought can fasten, a message to be developed and analysed. So in 'Old Pictures at Florence,' he contrasts the perfect beauty of Greek sculpture with the manifold imperfections of the early Christian painters, not as to their form, but with regard to the meaning which each can afford for the intellect. Indeed, the very beauty of form in Greek art is to him a sign of inferiority, because the failings and shortcomings of the Italian painters reveal a consciousness of the deeper meaning which they were striving to express.

Again, to pass from art to real life, Mr. Browning seems equally to penetrate through the outward form of the human being, to look upon the body as the expression of the soul within, rather than as possessing beauty, and therefore value, in itself. And this is compatible with the strong feeling he has for physical beauty, or rather the feeling springs from his belief that soul is

'Transparent through the flesh, by parts which prove a whole,
 By hints which make the soul discernible by soul.'

For the explanation which he gives in *Fifine at the Fair* of his interest in the body, and the beauty of it is, that

'. . . . bodies show me minds,
And through the outward sign the inward grace allures.'

So the disregard of the form of his poems, in his eager haste to express the matter, is only a particular case of the general characteristic of Mr. Browning's mind, which leads him

'To bring the invisible full into play!
Let the visible go to the dogs—what matters?'

And though we may regret that he has carried his principle so far as greatly to injure the poetical value of his writings—for, after all, art is the expression of thought or emotion by means of form, which cannot therefore with impunity be neglected—yet at the present time, when so much stress is laid on the mere mechanism of verse, and meaning is suffered to fall into the background, it is perhaps good that one of our greatest living poets should utter in every way a protest against the prevailing fashion, and stand forward as an obvious instance of the supremacy of matter over form.

Mere form by itself is capable of being brought to perfection by the artist, while the inner truth of things is an ideal to be striven after which can never be reached, and our apprehension of it, and our endeavours to present it as it is must always remain imperfect. So Mr. Browning's preference of matter to form is the result of what is perhaps the most fundamental characteristic of his mind, the belief that imperfection is a mark of progress, that man is superior to the beasts just because he is not made with all his powers complete for their work in his life, but must struggle onwards by means of failure in this world, to the perfection which can only be attained in the next. The thought, in various forms, recurs in almost every poem of any importance; and though it is only a very clear apprehension of the Christian truth, that this life is a time of probation, and that for man perfection would mean failure, for it would mean standing still, while the law of his life is progress, yet this truth is set in so many different lights, it is shown underlying so many of the problems of life, so essential to the right understanding of character and the due estimate of action, that we may consider it as the special lesson which it is given to Mr. Browning to teach us. Thus he applies it to art, and it forms the ground of the contrast already alluded to between the Greek and Italian art in 'Old Pictures at Florence:'

'Growth came when, looking your last on them all,
 You turned your eyes inwardly one fine day
 And cried with a start—What if we so small
 Be greater and grander the while than they!
 Are they perfect of lineament, perfect of stature?
 In both, of such lower types are we
 Precisely because of our wider nature;
 For time, theirs—ours, for eternity.

'To-day's brief passion limits their range;
 It seethes with the morrow for us and more.
 They are perfect—how else? they shall never change:
 We are faulty—why not? we have time in store.
 The Artificer's hand is not arrested
 With us; we are rough-hewn, nowise polished:
 They stand for our copy, and, once invested
 With all they can teach, we shall see them abolished.'

Therefore the outward beauty of art declined, for with this idea of growth in imperfection it became the object of the early painters to leave the ideal, to turn to man as he is, and show the soul, the 'new hopes' and 'new fears' shining 'through the flesh they fray.' The perfection of Greek art is a sign of its limitation:—

'Shall Man, such step within his endeavour,
 Man's face, have no more play and action
 Than joy which is crystallized for ever,
 Or grief, an eternal petrification?'

Again, he applies it to scholarship in the 'Grammarians' Funeral,' which, in spite of the painful grotesqueness of the form, is a grand declaration of the poet's belief in the dignity of a lofty ideal, in the vain effort to reach which life is spent:—

' . . . before living he'd learn how to live—
 No end to learning:
 Earn the means first—God surely will contrive
 Use for our learning.
 Others mistrust and say, "But time escapes:
 "Live now or never!"
 He said, "What's time? Leave Now for dogs and apes,
 Man has Forever."

'That low man seeks a little thing to do,
 Sees it and does it:
 This high man, with a great thing to pursue,
 Dies ere he knows it.

That low man goes on adding one to one,
 His hundred 's soon hit :
 This high man, aiming at a million,
 Misses an unit.
 That, has the world here—should he need the next,
 Let the world mind him !
 This, throws himself on God, and unperplexed,
 Seeking shall find Him.'

This idea of man's superiority because of his imperfection is of course primarily a religious idea, but it is a proof of the manner in which Mr. Browning's religious convictions penetrate and inform his whole intellectual and emotional nature, that, whatever the subject, this doctrine seems to be the explanation of the problem or the climax of the argument. As we have seen it employed to express the proper aim of art and learning, so it enters into his view of love, supplementing its imperfections, explaining its difficulties, and raising it from an earthly and merely sensuous passion to a work worthy of man, who 'has Forever.' 'Dis aliter visum,' turns mainly upon the application of this doctrine to love. The woman, whom when young the elderly scholar had the opportunity of loving and marrying, rebukes him passionately ten years later for having missed it only because he was old, and she was far below him in education and intellect :—

' You loved, with body worn and weak :
 I loved, with faculties to seek :
 Were both loves worthless since ill-clad ?

 ' Let the mere star-fish in his vault
 Crawl in a wash of weed, indeed,
 Rose-jacynth to the finger-tips :
 He, whole in body and soul, outstrips
 Man, found with either in default.

 ' But what's whole, can increase no more,
 Is dwarfed and dies, since here's its sphere.'

The predominance of this idea in Mr. Browning is perhaps the explanation in part of the line which his poetical genius has taken in its development. As he himself expresses it :—

' You saw me gather men and women,
 Live or dead or fashioned by my fancy,
 Enter each and all, and use their service,
 Speak from every mouth—the speech, a poem.'

[* The greater number of his poems, and probably the most characteristic and the finest, are analyses of character either

in the form of dialogue or monologue by the characters themselves, or, more rarely, in the poet's own person. His genius is essentially dramatic in one sense, namely, that he can leave his own personality to put himself into the position, or even into the very heart and soul of another person, 'live or dead or fashioned by my fancy,' and in that position and with that other mind allow his intellect and his imagination to work as vigorously as if he was speaking his own sentiments in his own person. In this faculty he is, we venture to say, second to no poet, unless it be Shakspeare. Many can throw themselves into another character so as to represent it acting, talking, thinking with consistency and truth; and this is the power of the imagination. But Mr. Browning exerts rather what we may call the imaginative intellect; not only does he endow his characters with life and truth, but in their persons he carries on the subtlest trains of reasoning, starting however only from the premises which the person in question would naturally assume, and therefore not necessarily true, or in accordance with the poet's own belief, but only consistent; and his imagination also seems to seize hold on their deepest emotions and give words to them with a power which, we repeat, is more nearly equal to Shakspeare's similar power than is that of any other poet. In 'The Last Ride Together,' for instance, the line—

'Who knows but the world may end to-night?'

may for depth and vividness of imaginative power be compared with Macduff's 'He has no children,' which is Mr. Ruskin's highest instance of this kind of imagination. Again, for the more intellectual working of Mr. Browning's imagination, take the passage in 'Bishop Blougram's Apology,' in which he suddenly develops a theory of the purpose of evil, ingenious and impressive in itself, and at the same time perfectly consistent with the imaginary character of the bishop—

'Some think, Creation's made to show him forth :

I say it's meant to hide him all it can,

And that's what all this blessed evil's for.'

But in what is more strictly dramatic power, the power of representing action, Mr. Browning is notably deficient. The whole interest of his dramas or dramatic monologues lies in the varying states of mind of the characters represented. The action is nothing, and the personages are interesting to the poet, not because of what they do, but of what they think and feel. What he delights to analyse and to describe are the

subtle changes of feeling, the hidden trains of thought that are overlooked by most observers, but nevertheless give to action its real value ; it is therefore immaterial to him whether the resulting action fails or succeeds ; indeed, failure is often an indication of a loftier ideal than any which success has aimed at.

' For thence—a paradox
Which comforts while it mocks,—
Shall life succeed in that it seems to fail ;
What I aspired to be,
And was not, comforts me ;
A brute I might have been, but would not sink i' the scale.

' Not on the vulgar mass
Called "work" must sentence pass,
Things done, that took the eye and had the price :
O'er which, from level stand,
The low world laid its hand,
Found straightway to its mind, could value in a trice :

' But all the world's coarse thumb
And finger failed to plumb,
So passed in making up the main account ;
All instincts immature,
All purposes unsure
That weighed not as his work, yet swelled the man's amount :

' Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and escaped ;
All, I could never be,
All, men ignored in me,
This, I was worth to God, whose wheel the pitcher shaped.'

This passage explains better than any other the poet's eagerness to analyse character, and his interest in the failures rather than the successes of his personages, real or imaginary, and the same explanation is given in a different way in *Fifine at the Fair*. In order to discover the real tendency of the faults and failures in human lives we must 'only get close enough.'

' And, consequent upon the learning how from strife
Grew peace—from evil, good—came knowledge that, to get
Acquaintance with the way o' the world, we must nor fret
Nor fume, on altitudes of self-sufficiency,
But bid a frank farewell to what—we think—should be,
And, with as good a grace, welcome what is—we find.'

So he collects characters from all countries and from all periods, obscure as René Gentilhomme, or illustrious as Andrea del Sarto, or the mere creations of his own imagination, as Bishop Blougram, and strives by means of them 'to get acquaintance with the way o' the world,' not hiding their faults, but trying to see them as they saw them, and to

' Hold the balance, shift

The weight from scale to scale, do justice to the drift
Of nature, and explain the glories by the shames
Mixed up in man, one stuff miscalled by different names
According to what stage i' the process turned his rough
Even as I gazed to smooth—only get close enough.'

Owing to this, his favourite method, it is of course difficult to say in any one case whether the thoughts put forward are Mr. Browning's real convictions, or only the dramatic workings of the mind he is investigating; but the very method itself affords us an insight into the poet's mind, gives us his estimate of human nature, and shows us the character and limits of the toleration which is so prominent in him. And if we find, in addition, that certain thoughts are continually coming up, certain explanations of conduct continually put forward, we are justified in taking these to be genuine principles held by Mr. Browning himself, and not merely by his characters.

Nevertheless, we believe that partly by the adoption of this method, partly by the doctrine which it illustrates, Mr. Browning has been considerably influenced in his view of truth. For the continued process of reasoning from other men's premises, of analysing actions not so much in their relation to absolute right and wrong as in relation to the position and character of the actor, could hardly fail in some degree to affect the perception of truth. And if we add to this Mr. Browning's belief that man advances by means of failure, that

' Life succeeds in that it seems to fail,'

we have sufficient explanation of his belief that truth is perhaps, after all, not to be attained by man. He must try to attain to it, and it certainly exists and will hereafter be reached; but in this life there may be no such thing as absolute truth which we can grasp, though every effort to lay hold of it brings us nearer to it. So he seems to turn from the pursuit with the conviction that in this, as in other things, we must be content to—

'. . . Learn, by failure, truth is forced
To manifest itself through falsehood. . . .'

His latest poem, 'The Two Poets of Croisic,' partly deals with the effect on the 'actual sense and thought' of a sudden, complete perception of truth; and he pronounces it to be incompatible with the conditions of our life here:

'I think no such direct plain truth consists
 With actual sense and thought and what they take
 To be the solid walls of life: mere mists—
 How such would, at that truth's first piercing, break
 Into the nullity they are!—slight lists
 Wherein the puppet-champions wage, for sake
 Of some mock-mistress, mimic war: laid low
 At trumpet-blast, there's shown the world, one foe!'

But by this 'mimic war' and the 'simulated thunder-claps which tell us counterfeit truths,'

'... we gain enough—yet not too much—
 Acquaintance with that outer element
 Wherein there's operation (call it such!)
 Quite of another kind than we the pent
 On earth are proper to receive. Our hutch
 Lights up at the least chink, let roof be rent—
 How inmates huddle, blinded at first spasm,
 Cognisant of the sun's self through the chasm!'

The utter falseness of our ordinary life is shown in the most vivid way by the 'vapoury films, enwoven circumstance' that could obscure the 'fame pearl-pure' of Pompilia in *The Ring and the Book*. The monk's sermon at the end of the poem describes with great power the blackness of the night of falsehood round the 'fame o' the martyr,' which deepens at each effort made to dissipate it, till only

'One wave of the hand of God amid the worlds
 Bids vapour vanish, darkness flee away,
 And leave the vexed star culminate in peace
 Approachable no more by earthly mists.'

And the melancholy lesson he draws from the whole history is the rarity of even such a tardy triumph of truth:—

'How many chaste and noble sister-fames
 Wanted the extricating hand, and lie
 Strangled, for one Pompilia proud above
 The welter, plucked from the world's calumny,
 Stupidity, simplicity—who cares?'

Of all his poems, *The Ring and the Book* contains the finest and most complete presentation of Mr. Browning's theory of truth. For while the lesson he draws from the whole is

' . . . That our human speech is nought,
Our human testimony false, our fame
And human estimation words and wind,'

the poem itself is a declaration of the reality of truth, of the utter blunder of the common conclusion in all such cases — 'there is much to be said on both sides,' or in other words, there is no possibility of finding the truth, and therefore probably there is no truth; at least, we need not trouble about it. Unless the truth is seen purely and absolutely, without any mixture of error, the facts narrated are inexplicable, and all attempts to explain them plunge deeper and deeper into falsehood. Say there is some truth on Guido's side, some on Pompilia's, and the whole becomes again confusion worse confounded: defend Pompilia and Caponsacchi from any point of view but one, and the defence is a worse falsehood than the attack; for it will be, as the poet shows in the wonderful speech of Pompilia's advocate, a perversion of the deepest moral laws, a darkening of the original light of right and wrong. The conclusion would seem to be: there is truth, but it is almost impossible that man can discover it; this story is a labyrinth to which there is only one clue, any other will lead you utterly astray, and, apparently, only God can in such cases hold that one clue.

' I demand assent
To the enunciation of my text
In face of one proof more that "God is true
"And every man a liar"—that who trusts
To human testimony for a fact
Gets this sole fact—himself is proved a fool;
Man's speech being false, if but by consequence
That only strength is true! while man is weak,
And, since truth seems reserved for heaven not earth,
Plagued here by earth's prerogative of lies,
Now learns to love and long for what, one day,
Approved by life's probation, he may speak.'

In estimating Mr. Browning's view of truth, we must remember both clauses of the text: if 'every man is a liar' and earth has a 'prerogative of lies,' yet 'God is true' and truth is 'reserved for heaven.'

In *Fifine at the Fair* he develops in an elaborate image, his view of the process by which—

'By practice with the false, we reach the true.'

Just as in swimming, the body is completely immersed

in water, and is kept alive only by 'man's due breath of air
i' the nostrils, high and dry,' and as any struggle to—

' . . Ascend breast-high : wave arms wide free of tether,
Be in the air and leave the water altogether,'

results in total submersion, and loss of the little air enjoyed
before, so, he says,—

' I liken to this play o' the body, fruitless strife
'To slip the sea and hold the heaven, my spirit's life
'Twixt false, whence it would break, and true where it would bide.
I move in, yet resist, am upborne every side
By what I beat against, an element too gross
To live in, did not soul duly obtain her dose
Of life-breath, and inhale from truth's pure plenitude
Above her, snatch and gain enough to just illude
With hope that some brave bound may baffle evermore
The obstructing medium, make who swam henceforward soar ;
Gain scarcely snatched when, foiled by the very effort, sowse,
Underneath ducks the soul, her truthward yearnings dowse
Deeper in falsehood ! ay, but fitted less and less
To bear in nose and mouth old briny bitterness
Proved alien more and more :
. . . . and yet our business with the sea
Is not with air, but just o' the water, watery :
We must endure the false, no particle of which
Do we acquaint us with, but up we mount a pitch
Above it, find our head reach truth, while hands explore
The false below.'

Here the attainment of truth is represented as not totally
impossible for man, but it can only be reached by aid of the
false, and in glimpses and snatches.

' Life means—learning to abhor
The false, and love the true, truth treasured snatch by snatch,
'Waits counted at their worth.'

By each effort to investigate the reality of what we see,
which is merely show and illusion, we are raised for an instant
into the true, we advance a step, though we seem to gain
nothing. This progress in individual cases, towards truth, by
means of falsehood, is the same doctrine as that which is de-
veloped in 'A Death in the Desert' in regard to the general
growth of the whole race. The poem consists mainly of a
long monologue, supposed to be spoken by S. John, just
before his death in a cave, whither he has been carried to
escape the persecution. The aged Apostle foresees the doubts
and difficulties which would hinder faith in future times, and

tries 'to help to bear it with you all,' and to relieve those who must undergo them. He imagines the questioner doubting of the fact of Christ's existence, because of the uncertainty of human testimony at such a distance of time. The answer begins by laying down the great principle underlying all Mr. Browning's thought:

'I say that man was made to grow, not stop ;
That help, he needed once, and needs no more,
Having grown but an inch by, is withdrawn :
For he hath new needs, and new helps to these.
This imports solely, man should mount on each
New height in view ; the help whereby he mounts,
The ladder-rung his foot has left, may fall,
Since all things suffer change save God the Truth.'

And again, man is

'Lower than God who knows all and can all,
Higher than beasts which know and can so far
As each beast's limit, perfect to an end,
Nor conscious that they know, nor craving more ;
While man knows partly but conceives beside,
Creeps ever on from fancies to the fact,
And in this striving, this converting air
Into a solid he may grasp and use,
Finds progress, man's distinctive mark alone,
Not God's, and not the beasts.'

There is evident danger, of course, in thus including the perception of truth among those qualities of man which advance by means of failure, whose function, indeed, is to fail, and only thereby to succeed ; with the other faculties, failure and imperfection only affect them, only prove their weakness ; for instance, the imperfection of human love only proves the weakness of the emotion, not necessarily any shortcoming in the object loved : but to ascribe failure, inevitable failure, to man's quest of truth may be taken just as well to mean the non-existence of the object as the weakness of the human faculty. But Mr. Browning does not leave us in doubt as to his belief in an ultimate reality, in a truth underlying all these mists and shows. Indeed, for him there are two great realities :

'Truth inside, and outside, truth also ; and between
Each, falsehood that is change, as truth is permanence.
The individual soul works through the shows of sense,
(Which, ever proving false, still promise to be true,)
Up to an outer soul as individual too ;
And, through the fleeting, lives to die into the fixed,
And reach at length "God, man, or both together mixed."

Still we may ask, whether all that lies between the soul and God, 'truth inside, and outside, truth also,' is falsehood; for that will include all the manifestations of God, all revelation, all the methods by which man has thought to draw near to God. The answer to this question brings us definitely to the subject of Mr. Browning's hold on Christianity.

It must be owned that if, as a matter of fact, he believes that the events recorded in the Gospels really happened, this is little more than an accidental circumstance: it does not seem to him to be of any real importance whether they did happen or not. In 'A Death in the Desert,' the question as to the reality of Christ's miracles is, not avoided but, neglected as unimportant. The belief in them certainly was created, and thereby came belief in Christ; but as to their reality, the Apostle does not pronounce:—

'I say, that miracle was duly wrought
When, save for it, no faith was possible.
Whether a change were wrought i' the shows o' the world,
Whether the change came from our minds which see
Of shows o' the world so much as and no more
Than God wills for His purpose . . .
. . . I know not; such was the effect.'

But when the further objection arises—

' . . . The fault was, first of all, in thee,
Thy story of the places, names, and dates,
Where, when and how the ultimate truth had rise,
—Thy prior truth, at last discovered none,
Whence now the second suffers detriment: '

the answer is once more the appeal to the necessity of growth for man:—

'Grant this, then man must pass from old to new,
From vain to real, from mistake to fact,
From what once seemed good, to what now proves best: '

which clearly leaves it in doubt whether the 'story of the places, and dates' may not be all 'vain' and 'mistake.' And the Pope, in *The Ring and the Book*, justifies this uncertainty even more clearly. He thoroughly believes, he says, the 'tale' of 'love without a limit,' which he finds revealed; but this only seems to apply to the innermost truth, the love revealed by the story, for as to the external facts, he goes on,

' whether a fact,
Absolute, abstract, unconditioned truth,

Historic, not reduced to suit man's mind,
 Or only truth reverberate, changed, made pass
 A spectrum into mind, the narrow eye,—
 The same and not the same, else unconceived—
 Though quite conceivable to the next grade
 Above it in intelligence,—as truth,
 Easy to man were blindness to the beast
 By parity of procedure,—the same truth
 In a new form, but changed in either case :
 What matter so intelligence be filled ?
 so my heart be struck,
 What care I,—by God's gloved hand or the bare.'

Here we see very plainly the influence of Mr. Browning's theory of truth. The only two truths being the soul and God, 'and between each, falsehood,' the method by which God works upon the soul must be by means of falsehood, or at best, of 'the shows o' the world.' As they are only shows, 'mere mists,' the question whether any particular combination of them really took place or not is insignificant, and the poet treats it doubtfully and vaguely. In *The Two Poets of Croisic* indeed, he describes a direct message from God to man as a setting aside of these intermediate shows :—

' all the universe
 Being abolished, all 'twixt God and him—
 Earth's praise or blame, its blessing or its curse,
 Of one and the same value,—to the brim
 Flooded with truth for better or for worse :'

but in the end, as we have seen, he pronounces 'such direct plain truth' impossible, in general, for us ; we should become too conscious of the illusion of the common conditions of our life.

Of course, there is nothing new in this acceptance of the inner truth of Christianity along with doubt, or even denial, of the facts of the Gospel history. In Mr. Browning's case, however, we must be careful, first, to take it in connexion with his general view of truth and falsehood, and of the unreality of external things ; and secondly, to remember the exceedingly firm hold that he has on the inner truth, or rather on several of the essential truths of Christianity. Mr. Browning deals with the great speculative difficulties of the day, not as if he himself was vitally interested in solving them, but as desirous of helping others, and of affording them an insight into the unity and coherence of his own faith. And we believe that the cause of this courage in thus stating and meditating upon objections to Christianity may

be found in the words put into the mouth of the Pope in *The Ring and the Book*, who has just asked the question, inspired by the worthlessness of contemporary Christian practice, 'Is the thing we see salvation?' He is quick to answer for himself:—

'. I
Put no such dreadful question to myself,
Within whose circle of experience burns
The central truth, Power, Wisdom, Goodness,—God.'

When Mr. Browning is discussing religious difficulties, even when he seems to be refining away the facts on which, for most, our religion rests, he always apparently possesses a confidence for which these words are the warrant; within his 'circle of experience' the 'central truth' does really 'burn,' and that truth is God. His religion works from the centre to the circumference, from the Being of God to the mode in which He has revealed Himself to man; and in the Being of God the chief, the one essential fact that he finds is Love, on which fact we may say that he builds his faith:—

'In youth I looked to these very skies,
And probing their immensities,
I found God there, His visible power;
Yet felt in my heart, amid all its sense
Of the power, an equal evidence
That His love, there too, was the nobler dower.
For the loving worm within its clod,
Were diviner than a loveless god
Amid his worlds, I dare to say.'

And in 'A Death in the Desert' he argues that man must justly call himself 'first, last, and best of things,' unless he acknowledges that, in God, Love coexists with might and will:—

'Since if man prove the sole existent thing
Where these combine, whatever their degree,
However weak the might or will or love,
So they be found there, put in evidence—
He is as surely higher in the scale
Than any might with neither love nor will,
As life, apparent in the poorest midge,
Is marvellous beyond dead Atlas' self,
Given to the nobler midge for resting-place!'

To give a complete representation of the great part which Love has in our conception of God, the poet imagines with wonderful power and truth the loveless god of the mere savage, in 'Caliban upon Setebos, or Natural Theology in the

Island,' which is Caliban's meditation upon the strange freaks and capricious power of 'his dam's god, Setebos.' The poem comes immediately after 'A Death in the Desert,' as if to emphasize the cardinal doctrine of the one, that God's essence is Love, and that

'Life, with all it yields of joy and woe,
And hope and fear,
Is just our chance o' the prize of learning love,
How love might be, hath been indeed, and is,'

by the terrible image, in the other, of the loveless power and will which Caliban has fashioned by reasoning from the phenomena of the world and of his own nature. The savage cannot imagine a loving God; even that which he believes to be 'over Setebos' is not love, but rather 'something quiet,' as distinguished from Setebos' restless activity, which 'came of being ill at ease.' And therefore, though he believes in 'the Quiet,' yet he 'never spends much thought nor care that way,' because the Quiet is only the germ of the logical conception of a First Cause, necessary, even to Caliban, in order to complete his theory of the universe, as the tortoise on which the elephant stands is necessary to the Hindoo philosopher, but of no practical importance, because, unlike Setebos, it does not 'make itself feared through what it does.' Few imaginative pictures cast such a dreary light upon the possibilities of our intellectual speculations, because it is so terribly complete in itself, and because the elimination of Love from our idea of God is all that stands between us and it. But the certainty of Mr. Browning's grasp of that idea enables him with impunity to play with such a subject; he is 'very sure of God,' and therefore Setebos has no terrors for him.

Now it is from his firm belief in God's Love that the poet has attained to the two great Christian truths which so continually come up in his writings, viz., the Incarnation and Immortality.

In the awful vision of 'Easter-Day,' which represents the soul standing before the Judge, when He has allowed it to keep the world it has chosen, but has stopped its exultation by showing the utter insufficiency of all that earth has, all its beauty, all its art, its science and philosophy, to satisfy the man when 'the goal's a ruin like the rest,' the wretched soul takes refuge in love, and prays to be allowed that only. But this also is denied, even while it is granted, by showing the uselessness of love without God's Love:—

' . . . Now take love ! Well betide
 Thy tardy conscience ! Haste to take
 The show of love for the name's sake,
 Remembering every moment Who
 Beside creating thee unto
 These ends, and these for thee, was said
 To undergo death in thy stead
 In flesh like thine : so ran the tale.
 What doubt in thee could countervail
 Belief in it ? Upon the ground
 " That in the story had been found
 Too much love ! How could God love so ? "
 He who in all His works below
 Adapted to the needs of man,
 Made love the basis of the plan,—
 Did love, as was demonstrated :
 While man, who was so fit instead
 To hate, as every day gave proof,—
 Man thought man, for his kind's behoof,
 Both could and did invent that scheme
 Of perfect love ; 't would well beseem
 Cain's nature thou wast wont to praise,
 Not tally with God's usual ways ! '

The fact that man possesses love is so far from being a proof that he invented the 'scheme of perfect love,' that it rather proves that God who gave him the love also gave him that final climax of love which is reached in the Incarnation and Atonement. So the poet rises from the love which is shewn in the outer world, from the love which man feels in himself to 'the love which tops the might, the Christ in God.' The argument that the presence of love in us is the proof of Christ is a main part of 'A Death in the Desert':—

' . . When, beholding that love everywhere,
 He reasons, " Since such love is everywhere,
 And since ourselves can love and would be loved,
 We ourselves make the love, and Christ was not—"
 How shall ye help this man who knows himself,
 That he must love and would be loved again,
 Yet, owning his own love that proveth Christ,
 Rejecteth Christ through very need of Him ? '

The Incarnation, thus viewed as the necessary completion of all we think or feel about God, ensures the truth of the whole system, of which it is the climax. The Pope, in *The Ring and the Book*, uses it to explain the mystery of sin and sorrow :—

' I can believe this dread machinery
 Of sin and sorrow, would confound me else,

Devised,—all pain, at most expenditure
 Of pain by Who devised pain,—to evolve,
 By new machinery in counterpart,
 The moral qualities of man—how else?—
 To make him love in turn and be beloved,
 Creative and self-sacrificing too,
 And thus eventually God-like.'

In this poem, and in 'Saul,' we find rather a different view from that which is given in 'A Death in the Desert,' and in 'Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day.' For in these, as we have seen, the love that is in the world and in man is made to lead us up to the perfect love of God manifested in Christ: in 'Saul,' and in *The Ring and the Book*, we find the thought that, while power and intelligence are plainly visible to us, we fail, in our present state, to see the perfect goodness of God. To complete, then, what is wanting, Christianity gives us the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Atonement:—

'What lacks, then, of perfection fit for God—
 But just the instance which this tale supplies
 Of love without a limit? So is strength,
 So is intelligence; let love be so,
 Unlimited in its self-sacrifice,
 Then is the tale true and God shows complete.'

But, if there is a contradiction between the two, we should imagine that the first, the Incarnation proved by God's Love, is Mr. Browning's own conviction, as more in accordance with the general tendency of his mind; while the second, God's Love proved by the Incarnation, may be adopted to suit the characters into whose mouths it is put. In either case, the manifestation of God's Love by the Incarnation is the climax of religion, the triumph of Christianity. Thus, at the end of the wonderful 'Epistle of Karshish, the Arab Physician,' in which he relates his analysis of the case of Lazarus, whom he has seen; after describing it as madness caused by the epileptic trance from which a 'Nazarene Physician' roused him, he gives with affected contempt mingled with terror, Lazarus' belief that his Healer was

' God Himself,
 Creator and sustainer of the world,
 That came and dwelt in flesh on it awhile !'

But though he affects to despise it as a 'trivial matter' not to be compared with the 'blue-flowering borage' he has discovered, yet at the end the correspondence between Lazarus' belief and the innate longing of man for God's Love draws him back, as it were, unwillingly:—

'The very God ! think, Abib ; dost thou think ?
 So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving too,—
 So, through the thunder comes a human voice
 Saying, " O heart I made, a heart beats here !
 Face, my hands fashioned, see it in myself !
 Thou hast no power nor may'st conceive of mine,
 But love I gave thee, with myself to love,
 And thou must love me who have died for thee ! "
 The madman saith He said so ; it is strange.'

The same thrilling joy at the vision of an Incarnate God suffering for man, and thereby manifesting His love, is the climax of the magnificent ascent from earth to heaven, from human to divine, which is the subject of 'Saul':—

'Tis the weakness in strength, that I cry for ! my flesh, that I seek
 In the Godhead ! I seek and I find it. O Saul, it shall be
 A Face like my face that receives thee ; a Man like to me,
 Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever : a Hand like this hand
 Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee ! See the Christ
 stand !'

Here we have the other greater truth so firmly held by Mr. Browning, the immortality of the soul, combined with the truth of the Incarnation. Nothing in modern poetry is finer than the gradual development of the great song, with which David cheers the vexed spirit of Saul. From the peaceful pastoral scenes which he knows so well, and the varied incidents of national life, the burial song, the 'glad chaunt of the marriage,' the sacred chorus as the Levites go up to the altar, and then the triumphant celebration of Saul's personal greatness, he passes on, in his effort to find a subject which shall restore to the king his delight in living, to the joys of the spirit which in old age shall rejoice in the results of its own past deeds : and even after death he shall not seem to die, for the record of his deeds shall be transmitted, graven on the rock, to all posterity, and 'unborn generations' shall have their part in his being. Here, having reached the height of merely human blessings, standing where Positivism, with its immortality of renown, is forced to stop, he is dissatisfied, longing for something further :—

' . . Could I help thee, my father, inventing a bliss,
 I would add, to that life of the past, both the future and this ;
 I would give thee new life altogether, as good, ages hence,
 As this moment,—had love but the warrant, love's heart to dispense !'

Here we have the same thought as that which is prominent in *La Saisiaz*, viz., the utter insufficiency of the Posi-

tivist idea of immortality to content man's longing, and the effort to explore further : only in his latest poem the exploration is carried on by means of close reasoning, in 'Saul' by an inspired burst of prophecy, in which David, having witnessed to God's perfection in all His works, declares His belief in the perfection of His Love, which shall give to Saul one gift far beyond the earthly abundance that he already has, the gift of eternal life.

'Ay, to save and redeem and restore him, maintain at the height
This perfection—succeed with life's dayspring, death's minute of
night.

Interpose at the difficult minute, snatch Saul, the mistake,
Saul, the failure, the ruin he seems now,—and bid him awake
From the dream, the probation, the prelude, to find himself set
Clear and safe in new light and new life,—a new harmony yet
To be run, and continued, and ended—who knows?—or endure!
The man taught enough by life's dream, of the rest to make sure;
By the pain-throb, triumphantly winning intensified bliss,
And the next world's reward and repose, by the struggles in this.'

And the means by which this last gift will be bestowed will be the final revelation of God's Love in the Atonement, the 'weakness in strength,' the Human Hand throwing 'open the gates of new life to thee.'

The certainty of immortality thus founded upon our certainty of God's Love, is again declared by Mr. Browning in 'Christmas Eve'—

'He who endlessly was teaching,
Above my spirit's utmost reaching,
What love can do in the leaf or stone,

Would never need that I, in turn,
Should point him out defect unheeded,
And show that God had yet to learn
What the meanest human creature needed,
— Not life, to wit, for a few short years.

No, love which, on earth, amid all the shows of it,
Has ever been the sole good of life in it,
The love, ever growing there, spite of the strife in it,
Shall arise, made perfect, from death's repose of it.'

And the hopelessness of ever seeing the one truth, unless we first possess the other, is finely shown in 'Cleone,' who, like David in 'Saul,' dismisses the Positivist hope of immortality with contempt, but sees no greater hope beyond it, because he does not know God as Love. And, therefore, to the heathen poet the thought which to the Christian is a source

of rejoicing, viz., the consciousness of man's failure to reach the ideal that he has power to form, is a deep discouragement: 'most progress is most failure, thou sayest well.' To him immortality is suggested, though he cannot believe in it, by the soul's unlimited desire for joy which cannot here be satisfied; to 'Rabbi Ben Ezra' by the object of man's existence, the service of God, which is attained only after death, after the 'machinery' of this life has fitted the soul for that purpose; to Pompilia by the undying love which cannot find its full manifestation in this troubled world, and therefore necessitates a world beyond it. In all these cases, and many others, we see the conception of immortality entering into every part of Mr. Browning's experience of life, dignifying things that would otherwise seem trivial, making perfect the manifold imperfections of this world. The grandest expression of this is in 'Abt Vogler,' who is led to the subject by his regret at the quick vanishing of the 'palace of music' he has reared—

'Therefore to whom turn I but to thee, the ineffable Name?
 Builder and Maker, thou, of houses not made with hands!
 What, have fear of change from thee who art ever the same?
 Doubt that thy power can fill the heart that thy power expands?
 There shall never be one lost good! what was, shall live as before;
 The evil is null, is nought, is silence implying sound;
 What was good, shall be good, with, for evil, so much good more;
 On the earth the broken arcs; in the heaven a perfect round.
 All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good, shall exist;
 Not its semblance, but itself; no beauty, nor good, nor power
 Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the melodist
 When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.
 The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,
 The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,
 Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;
 Enough that he heard it once: we shall hear it by-and-by.'

It is this conviction of the future, this intense belief that 'no work begun shall ever pause for death,' that raises Mr. Browning's interest in man, and his persistent examination and analysis of characters and deeds which many would think unworthy to be touched, to a dignity which would not be possible if human life were bounded by this world, or even if the future life were to be, as so many believe, entirely separate and distinct in its nature from this. A future life in which nothing of our present existence survives, which is merely the reward, and not the result, of the good which has been attained here, is not Mr. Browning's conception of our promised im-

mortality; and therefore to him all these traits of character that had almost perished, these persons and deeds that but for him no one would have remembered, are of intense interest, because in his eyes they have an eternal significance.

Thus the body, which in itself is nothing, has yet the greatest importance as the 'dress' of the soul, as the means by which the soul is recognised by another soul, as the material which the soul shapes and transforms in its upward progress:—

"But the soul is not the body;" and the breath is not the flute;
Both together make the music; either marred and all is mute.'

Therefore, though the poet appears at first sight to be a spiritualist of the most transcendental kind, yet one quickly perceives that for him the body is not only the empty show that a false philosophy would make it, but, when informed by the soul, has a meaning for all eternity:—

'But the time will come,—at last it will,
When, Evelyn Hope, what meant (I shall say)
In the lower earth, in the years long still,
That body and soul so pure and gay?
Why your hair was amber, I shall divine,
And your mouth of your own geranium's red—
And what you would do with me, in fine,
In the new life to come in the old one's stead.'

And though, in 'Rabbi Ben Ezra' the one side is stated most forcibly and truly—

'To man, propose this test—
Thy body at its best,

How far can that project thy soul on its lone way?'

yet there follows immediately the other side with equal truth

'Let us not always say
"Spite of this flesh to-day
I strove, made head, gained ground upon the whole."
As the bird wings and sings,
Let us cry, "All good things
Are ours, nor soul helps flesh more, now, than flesh helps soul."'

We believe that a conscientious study of Mr. Browning's various hints concerning the relation between soul and body is likely to be of great value to anyone who wishes to find the just and Christian mean between a false spiritualism on the one side and a false materialism on the other. In such an endeavour poems like 'Rabbi Ben Ezra,' 'Fifine at the Fair,' 'Evelyn Hope,' 'The Flight of the Duchess' (with its

wonderful picture of the soul subduing and controlling the body to its own purposes) will, we believe, point to the true solution of the problem, more by the imaginative power with which the work of either is presented, than by any reasoned statement of the exact relations between them.

Lastly, we may say the same of Mr. Browning's treatment of love. Few poets have given greater prominence to the lower element in love, the purely passionate or even sensuous element. Few poets have shown themselves more conscious of the power of physical beauty in determining love, or have described it with greater energy and warmth. In his dramatic poems he seems to have a special insight into the deepest emotions whether of disappointed or of gratified passion. In 'Pippa Passes,' or in 'In a Gondola,' or in 'Too Late,' these are depicted with a vigour and a truth which testifies to the poet's perception of the importance of the lower, or animal element in human love. And yet we will venture to say that no poet has ever risen to greater heights of spirituality in this particular sphere of his art. Love is a prominent subject in very many of his poems, and wherever the character represented will allow of it, he lifts it far above the region of mere passion, in which, nevertheless, the feeling had its rise, into the future life, in which the pure self-sacrificing love which has begun on earth will find its full development. Thus Pompilia, in the splendid burst of emotion which ends her dying monologue, dwells upon these two points, the self-sacrifice of true love, and its continuance hereafter:—

'Ever with Caponsacchi ! otherwise
Here alone would be failure, loss to me—
How much more loss to him, with life debarred
From giving life, love locked from love's display,
The daystar stopped its task that makes night morn !
O lover of my life, O soldier-saint,
No work begun shall ever pause for death !
Love will be helpful to me more and more
I' the coming course, the new path I must tread,
My weak hand in thy strong hand, strong for that !'

This it is, then, that raises Mr. Browning's conception of love: he means by it not merely a moment's passion which shall sooner or later pass away, but a life of love; and his belief in the continuity of our life to all eternity gives therefore to love the highest meaning even when 'the obvious human bliss' which first drew two souls together has passed. So, in the beautiful stanzas, 'By the Fireside,' the speaker recalls the 'moment, one and infinite,' whose 'product,' had

he not seized it, might have been failure, as in '*Dis aliter visum*,' but which he did not suffer to let slip, and therefore

'I am named and known by that moment's feat :
There took my station and degree ;
So grew my own small life complete,
As nature obtained her best of me—
One born to love you, sweet !'

And the justification for this high estimate of the worth of that one moment is the same as *Pompilia's* prolongation of the work of love into the next world :—

'My own, see where the years conduct !
At first, 'twas something our two souls
Should mix as mists do ; each is sucked
In each now : on, the new stream rolls,
Whatever rocks obstruct.

'Think, when our one soul understands
The great Word which makes all things new,
When earth breaks up and heaven expands,
How will the change strike me and you
In the house not made with hands ?

'Oh, I must feel your brain prompt mine,
Your heart anticipate my heart,
You must be just before, in fine,
See and make me see, for your part,
New depths of the divine !'

Even in the unpleasant '*Red Cotton Night-cap Country*,' we get a glimpse, amidst all the mean and horrible circumstances of the story, of the poet's own ideal of love, which is ready to sacrifice itself for the sake of raising the loved one to a higher level :—

' . . . Friend, I do not praise her love !
True love works never for the loved one so,
Nor spares skin-surface, smoothening truth away.
Love bids touch truth, endure truth, and embrace
Truth, though, embracing truth, love crush itself.
"Worship not me, but God !" the angels urge :
That is love's grandeur.'

We cannot understand Mr. Browning's double treatment of love, so passionate and yet so spiritual, unless we bear in mind his similar treatment of body and soul, to both of which he assigns their due proportion in man's nature, because both are facts which must be accepted. Both elements, in the same way, exist in human love ; and the poet, whose notion of art is that it is

'The love of loving, rage
Of knowing, seeing, feeling the absolute truth of things
For truth's sake, whole and sole, nor any good, truth brings
The knower, seer, feeler, beside,'

must take them as they are : Mr. Browning's superiority over other poets, who make the lower element prominent, is that by his acceptance of both he has raised both to a height which few have been able to reach. The love which he describes would be unworthy were it only the momentary passion : as he holds it to be the eternal union of two souls, marriage as distinct from love in the common sense, he is able, speaking now for once confessedly in his own person, to show how man is dignified and exalted by it :—

'God be thanked, the meanest of his creatures
Boasts two soul-sides, one to face the world with,
One to show a woman when he loves her !
This I say of me, but think of you, Love !
This to you—yourself my moon of poets !
Ah, but that's the world's side, there's the wonder,
Thus they see you, praise you, think they know you !
There in turn I stand with them and praise you.
Out of my own self, I dare to phrase it.
But the best is when I glide from out them,
Cross a step or two of dubious twilight,
Come out on the other side, the novel
Silent silver lights and darks undreamed of,
Where I hush and bless myself with silence.'

In conclusion, then, we should wish our readers to take this as the noblest characteristic of Mr. Browning's genius : this power of exalting men and man's deeds, not by idealising him, or by taking him out of the real conditions of his life, but by giving him his true dignity as an immortal being, whom God's love has placed here to grow and to prepare himself for a wider, more perfect life hereafter. We cannot fail to learn from Mr. Browning's poems a higher and nobler, because a truer, conception of mankind ; for he bases his sympathy with men, and his firm belief in their great destiny, on a truth that can never alter, the truth that God is Love.

ART. IV.—LECKY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

1. *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century.* By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. Two Volumes.
2. *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland.* By JOHN P. PRENDERGAST, Barrister-at-Law.
3. *The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. Three Volumes.

IN undertaking to write the History of England during the last century, Mr. Lecky conceives himself to have departed so far from the system generally adopted by historians, that it becomes necessary for him to explain his own plan of composition, and the chief objects at which he has aimed. Of the principal military events, or of the incidents of party strife, 'which form so large a part of political annals,' he has proposed to himself to give a broad general view, rather than a detailed account; thinking it more important 'to disengage from the great mass of facts those which relate to the permanent forces of the nation, or which indicate the more enduring features of national life; the growth or decline of the monarchy, the aristocracy and the democracy; of the Church and Dissent; of the agricultural, the manufacturing, and the commercial interests; the increasing power of Parliament and of the people; the history of political ideas, of arts, of manners, and of beliefs; the changes that have taken place in the social and economical condition of the people; the influences that have modified national character,' &c.—(Pref. v.) His plan, in short, bears a strong resemblance to that which Mr. Green also has adopted in his *History of the English People*, and it certainly has the merit of presenting a philosophical view of history; since, though stubbornly fought battles and brilliant victories are doubtless more picturesque incidents than the passing of a new law, or the introduction of a new mode of conveyance; yet the triumphs of the conqueror do not always permanently affect either the victorious or the defeated people; while social changes, both in themselves, and as the parents of further changes, in most cases affect future generations, and, in many instances, the subsequent condition of

the people throughout all time. How little trace of influence have Crécy or Poitiers, or even St. Alban's or Tewkesbury, left on the history of either England or France. But the impeachment of Lord Latimer established a principle which to this day is regarded as one of the strongest bulwarks of the national liberties; and Caxton's printing press is the very foundation of modern civilisation in every land in which our language is spoken.

Such a plan, indeed, as Mr. Lecky's, though, if history could be written in one form alone, perhaps more valuable than one chiefly occupied by battles abroad or party strifes at home, is necessarily imperfect: it takes somewhat too slight account of those who were real heroes in their day, and of that glory, which, though often purchased at excessive cost, and sometimes achieved in a cause of doubtful justice, is still a heritage of real and imperishable value to a high-spirited nation; inculcating by example the duties of courage, loyalty, patriotism, and unselfish devotion. If in the time of Juvenal the fame of Demosthenes and Cicero prompted the school-boy to aim at oratorical excellence, we cannot doubt that many a youthful subject of Victoria is cherishing the hope of emulating the thunder of Chatham, or the close logic of Pitt or Canning; that many an ensign, as he girds on his maiden sword, many a midshipman as with faltering giddy steps he clammers to the masthead, looks forward to the day when he too may beat 40,000 men in forty minutes, like Wellington at Salamanca, or lead on his blue-jackets to do their duty to England like Nelson at Trafalgar. Our greatest historians have, therefore, combined each kind of subject in their narratives. Macaulay, in his celebrated third chapter, was but following the example which Hume had set in those appendices to his different chapters, which, though their title too often causes them to be overlooked, are, in truth, not the least valuable or interesting portions of his immortal work. But Mr. Lecky, we may believe, thought that for his special period he might follow the bent of his inclination, and pass lightly over the triumphs of war and the intrigues of party, with the greater excuse, because such events have been already most copiously dwelt on by Lord Stanhope, whose work, if somewhat dry in arrangement and stilted in style, fully deserves the praise which Mr. Lecky bestows on it of 'range and accuracy of research,' . . . 'transparent honesty of purpose, and the fulness and fairness with which he seldom fails to recount the faults of those with whom he agrees, and the merits of those with whom he differs' (Pref. vi.)

To these praises which he justly bestows on the earlier writer, Mr. Lecky himself is equally entitled, as also to that of taking a broader view of his whole subject, and displaying far more of that philosophical power to trace the connexion of events, and also to estimate the characters of the actors in them, which is perhaps the most important, as it certainly is the most attractive quality, in a history which aims at being a possession for ever. In weighing the characters of our most eminent statesmen, he seems to us to be admirably impartial and fair. We do not, indeed, always agree with his estimate of them. When, for instance, he affirms that Walpole 'deliberately made corruption the basis of his rule' (i. 365), we prefer agreeing with Burke, who may be said to have spoken not without some personal knowledge of the facts to which he was alluding, that 'he was far from governing by corruption. He governed by party attachments. The charge of systematic corruption is less applicable to him perhaps than to any minister who ever served the Crown for so great a length of time.'¹ And still less can we follow him when he quotes with evident approbation Grattan's comparison between the two Pitts, that the father 'was not perhaps so good a debater as his son; but was a much better orator, a greater scholar, and a far greater man' (ii. 472). The first two phrases in this eulogy may perhaps balance one another; though when Mr. Lecky admits that 'Lord Chatham's taste was far from pure, and that there was much in his speeches that was florid and meretricious, and not a little that would have appeared absurd bombast, but for the amazing power of his delivery' (*ib.* 470), he makes serious deductions from his claim to the best kind of eloquence; deductions which no one ever made from the speeches of his son. But to assert that the man who, as his sister said of him, knew but two books, the *Æneid* and the *Faerie Queene*, was superior in scholarship to one who, with the exception of his rival Fox, had probably no equal for knowledge of the great authors of antiquity in either house of Parliament, is little short of a palpable absurdity; and in all that constitutes the real greatness of a man or a statesman, we should not fear to undertake the task of upholding the son's renown against that of any of his predecessors, contemporaries, or successors.

We may, however, suspect that Grattan's estimate of the two men was in some degree coloured by his personal feelings. With Lord Chatham he had never been in antagonism. On

¹ 'Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs.'

one great subject, the dispute with America, he had been his follower and ally; advocating in the Irish House of Commons the same cause which Chatham upheld in the English House of Peers. But to Pitt he had been almost constantly opposed. By Pitt he and his party, whether in the English, or, so long as it lasted, in the Irish Parliament, had been repeatedly defeated. The Union, of which he had been the most indefatigable opponent,¹ and to which he was never entirely reconciled, had been carried in his despite; and it was hardly unnatural that the recollection of his long and unsuccessful warfare should in some degree bias his judgment, and prompt him to an undeserved disparagement of the minister by whose wisdom and firmness he had been so often overborne.

We may, perhaps, hereafter find another opportunity of examining the author's views of the English statesmen who flourished, and of the general policy pursued by successive administrations, during the century in question. At present we have a different object in view. Ireland is still, as it has been for many generations, one of the chief difficulties of the Government, and Mr. Lecky, who is an Irishman, has devoted more than a quarter of the two volumes before us to an elaborate investigation of the causes which have made her such; going back, for that purpose, beyond the limits indicated on his title-page, and tracing, with care and sufficient minuteness, the history of his country from the completion of the English ascendancy, which 'dates only from the great wars of Elizabeth, which broke the force of semi-independent chieftains, crushed the native population to the dust, and established the complete authority of English law' (i. 95). In its earlier stages, he is far from looking on that ascendancy as a blessing to the Irish; on the contrary, he affirms that in its history we may trace with singular clearness the perverting and degrading influence of great legislative injustices, and the manner in which they affect in turn every element of national well-being' (ib. 92). And he excuses or justifies the large space which he has devoted to that part of his subject, by the assertion

¹ Sir Archibald Alison, in the second part of his *History of Europe*, c. x. § 53, has fallen into the strange mistake of asserting that 'he (Grattan) had been a warm supporter of the Union.' He was so far from being so, that, having retired from Parliament for a while, he procured a seat in the winter of 1799 for the express purpose of opposing it; paying for it, according to Lord Stanhope, quoting the Cornwallis Correspondence (*Life of Pitt*, iii. 222), 2,400*l.* And on January 15, 1800, he spoke against the project, as the same writer relates, 'with extraordinary weight and force; and he levelled his declamation more especially against the published speech of Mr. Pitt.'

that 'this portion of the history of the empire has usually been treated by English historians in a very superficial and perfunctory manner; and it has been obscured by many contradictions, by much prejudice and misrepresentation' (i. 92).

The same history has been related by a very popular English writer of the present day, Mr. Froude, in what certainly cannot be described as a superficial manner; but it is not improbable that Mr. Froude's work, *The English in Ireland*, may have been among the causes which have induced Mr. Lecky to devote so much of his attention to the subject, since he is so far from acquitting that historian of prejudice and misrepresentation, that he expressly charges him with deliberately 'intending to blacken to the utmost the character of the Irish people, and especially of the Irish Catholics' (i. 101). The accusation is a heavy one, and though, perhaps, not without plausible grounds, one which we cannot allow to be deserved. We do not believe that Mr. Froude ever knowingly misstates a fact, or intentionally misrepresents a motive; but he is undoubtedly a most hasty writer, careless even in the quotation of documents accessible to all; and he writes under the influence of the strongest prejudices and the most singular theories, which certainly find abundant expression in these volumes. He is at all times a professed advocate of strong measures, and even his narrative of the proceedings of Henry VIII. does not contain more startling eulogies of persecution and remorseless bloodshedding than the work before us. Nay, for one passage we should search the records of the fiercest fanaticism in vain to find a parallel. Not content with defending the hideous massacres of Drogheda and Wexford, massacres in which, if the peaceful victims were Irish, the soldiers who perished were English, he actually laments that 'forty years later there was not a second Cromwell before Limerick'—(i. 126)—in other words, that the chivalrous Sarsfield, that his heroic garrison, who a year before had beaten back the English besiegers from ramparts which their 'French allies' had pronounced indefensible for a single day, and that a civil population then only exceeded in numbers by those of Dublin and Cork, and in industry and prosperity second to none in the island, were not ruthlessly slaughtered for the sole offence of upholding the cause of one who in their eyes had never forfeited his right to their allegiance. Mr. Froude deliberately calls it an act of weak, mistaken 'amiability' in William (not often so accused) 'to refuse to look upon the people of Limerick as rebels when they were in arms for one whom they regarded as their natural sovereign, and to shrink

from pushing a war to extremities which must then be followed by fresh forfeitures' (i. 195). A history, written in the spirit which dictated these sentences may well be thought by Irish writers to require an antidote, though Mr. Froude perhaps meant his own work as in some degree an antidote to the narrative of one passage in Irish history, the Cromwellian Settlement as it is called, which a year or two before had been given to the world by Mr. Prendergast, to which indeed he refers on one occasion with a warm acknowledgment of its impartiality and candour. In his view, he and Mr. Prendergast differ, not on the facts of Irish history, but 'on the opinion to be formed about them;' and he accounts for the difference by explaining that Mr. Prendergast 'writes as an Irish patriot, he himself as an Englishman' (i. 134, *note*).

It is not invariably correct to say that he and the Irish writers always agree in their statement of facts, and one remarkable instance in which they differ is of great importance in the eyes of the English historian, 'because the justification of the subsequent policy of England towards Ireland depends upon the truth of events of which the recollection was kept alive for a century by a solemn annual commemoration' (i. 100). He is alluding to Sir Phelim O'Neil's rebellion of 1641, in his narrative of which he differs widely from Mr. Prendergast and Mr. Lecky as to matters of fact, as to the motives for the insurrection, as to the share which religious fanaticism and the Roman Catholic priests had in it, and as to the number of its victims. According to his view it had its origin in antipathies of race and religion; and its primary objects were 'the utter extinction of the English settlement and the English religion at once and for ever.' As the Irish writers regard it, the end first proposed was solely the recovery of the land from the English settlers whom James had placed in possession of it, the undoing of the plantation of Ulster and of some of the more southern counties,¹ by the expulsion of the foreign intruders; and, though neither of them denies that the violence by which alone such ejections could be accomplished gradually grew by its own indulgence and success into a ferocity which was abhorrent to the original leaders,² they nevertheless believe that massacre formed no

¹ Leitrim, Longford, King's County, and Wexford (Pr. p. 45).

² It may be observed that Mr. Froude himself, though in one place he speaks of Sir Phelim's barbarities, in another page quotes evidence that he was so far from approving the murders which were committed, that he actually hanged some of the perpetrators, and his own foster-brother among them (i. 107, *note*).

part of the original design, and that the number of victims who did perish has been exaggerated with more than the usual licence of party animosity. Mr. Froude, though too shrewd and experienced a judge of evidence to adopt the assertions of Sir John Temple, that 150,000 were slain in two months, and 300,000 in two years (the smaller number exceeding that of all the Protestants in the island), quotes a computation of 20,000 as 'a moderate and probable estimate of those who were killed in the first two months' (i. 112, *note*). Mr. Prendergast and Mr. Lecky contend that there is no 'positive evidence' of the slaughter of an eighth part of that number, and produce such irresistible proof of the successful care in many instances taken by the insurgents to save the lives of those whom they had expelled from their homes, that we regard the balance of probability as greatly in their favour.

Another question of fact arising out of the same event shows the disagreement of Mr. Froude and Mr. Lecky in an equally marked degree, and is even more worthy of attention, because the religious differences, which in those days divided the population, are still the principal cause of its disquietude. With the passion for the recovery of the land Mr. Lecky admits that zeal for the Roman Catholic religion was combined in the minds of the rebels. But it was a defensive zeal, arising out of a fear that the Puritan Parliament in England was inflexibly bent on the extirpation of that religion. Several priests had recently been hanged for no offence but that of celebrating the mass; and when the King asserted his prerogative of mercy to reprieve others, their pardon was formally complained of in the House of Commons. No wonder, therefore, that the Roman Catholic clergy in general became alarmed for their personal safety. But, though Mr. Lecky admits that from the first they favoured the insurrection, and though he brands two especially, one a bishop named Maguire, as instigators of and actors in some of the worst atrocities of all, he affirms that the majority deprecated, and, so far as they could, prevented bloodshed. He cites their treatment of Bishop Bedell, who, though he had been 'actively engaged in proselytising, and one of the most conspicuous and uncompromising opponents then living of the Catholic faith,' was treated by the rebels when he fell into their hands with uniform deference. When he died in 1643, a rebel guard of honour fired a volley over his grave, and a priest pronounced his panegyric (ii. 167). And he concludes that on 'the whole a candid reader will rather wonder that the part played by the priests was not larger.'

Mr. Froude, on the contrary, who, ever since he renounced his own orders, seems to regard the clergy of every denomination with especial antipathy; who has but little favour for Laud in England, for Usher and Bramhall, or even for Jeremy Taylor in Ireland, denounces the Roman Catholic priests as those to whom, above all, the worst horrors of the rebellion were due. The lay leaders he describes as the 'less violent party,' while the priests pronounced 'all heretics disentitled to mercy.' He affirms that when at one great meeting held to discuss the arrangements for the outbreak, they found themselves overruled, 'they departed unconvinced, and determined to take their own way' (i. 95). Again, when he speaks of the rebels as 'not human beings; not even human savages, but ferocious beasts,' he lays the guilt of the unnatural transformation on the priests, and quotes with cordial approval the explanation of Sir John Temple, the author of exaggerations so preposterous that he is himself forced to discard some of his imputations, that 'the priests had so charmed the Irish, and had laid such bloody impressions on them, as it was held a mortal sin to give relief or protection to the English' (i. 101).

Yet, if Mr. Froude were strictly faithful to his principles, the ferocity imputed to the priests might have expected a little more indulgence; since there is no maxim which he inculcates with more reiterated and emphatic persistence than that lenity and toleration are proofs of and synonyms for weakness and impolicy; that coercion and persecution are sound in principle, and certain to be successful in practice. The very climax of his eulogy of Cromwell is that 'the religion of the Irish, out of which the worst of these crimes had originated, was proscribed' by him (i. 136). The worst fault committed by William III. was that he 'had indulgence for the Irish race and the Irish religion,' and repeated 'an experiment which had been tried many times, and had invariably failed' (207), that he left 'the conquest imperfect,' when he had the opportunity, 'without real injustice, of making Ireland a Protestant country' (209) by renewing the horrors of Drogheda and Wexford at Limerick, and, it must be presumed, expelling those whom he could neither slaughter nor convert. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes is not usually considered a very bright page in the annals of Louis XIV. But our English historian is so far from blaming it that he sees in that worst act of that profligate and hard-hearted bigot only an example which the British Sovereign should have followed; and, declaring that the belief of the Roman

Catholic 'makes rebellion a duty,' lays it down as an unanswerable proposition that 'no Government need keep terms with such a creed when there is power to abolish it,' and that 'to call the repression of such opinion by the name of religious persecution is a mere abuse of words' (i. 213).

These passages are sufficient to show how absolutely opposed to each other are the guiding principles of these writers, though Mr. Prendergast and Mr. Lecky are Protestants as well as Mr. Froude; while another of his propositions as to the civil policy which England has generally pursued towards Ireland, is no less at variance with the creed accepted by the Irish writers than his notions of wise and just ecclesiastical government. As he reads the annals of the last century, the 'difficulty' of ruling Ireland arises from what 'has been at once the honour and perplexity of English relations from first to last, because the effort of the conquerors was to govern Ireland, not as a vassal province, but as a free nation' (i. 18). Had such been the policy of England in the eighteenth century, it would hardly have needed the justification of which, as we have seen, the author speaks as supplied by the history of the rebellion of 1641. But we fear that we must rather agree with Mr. Lecky that for many years that policy was one of great legislative injustice, and that the restrictions imposed by English jealousy on Irish commerce proved that it was as a vassal and dependency, not as a member of an empire governed by equal laws and possessing equal rights, that Ireland was, during the first four reigns after the revolution, regarded by the English Ministers and Parliament.

It would, however, occupy too much of our space, and be a wearisome rather than a profitable task to dwell further on the difference of the light in which the writers, all men of acknowledged ability, and all no doubt equally earnest in the pursuit of what they believe to be truth, view and record the same transactions. It will be, we hope, a more useful employment to endeavour to construct from their conflicting narratives and doctrines a brief sketch of the policy pursued towards Ireland by the English Government since the final establishment of William III. as the unresisted sovereign of both islands. The period, almost 190 years, may be divided into two portions of nearly equal duration, from 1692 to 1782, and from 1782 to the present day. As to the first, if Mr. Lecky brings a heavy indictment against England, his charge is fully admitted by Mr. Froude, in a passage not quite consistent with that which we quoted just now, but in which he charges her with having 'refused a legislative union when

Ireland asked for it,' and deliberately 'destroyed Irish manufactures, ruined Irish trade, and demoralised the entire people.' And it has recently been confessed with still greater frankness by a great English orator, who has compared the treatment of Ireland by England to that of Poland by Russia. And though, in this instance, we may believe that he was hurried by the excitement of the moment into some rhetorical exaggeration, we fear that the most sober examination will force upon us the conviction that too hard things can scarcely be said of the policy adopted by England towards her weaker sister in the former of the two periods indicated.

The repression of Irish trade, which both Froude and Lecky so justly stigmatise, had indeed been commenced before the Revolution. As early as 1663, Ireland had been excluded from the provisions of the Navigation Act, an exclusion which at once destroyed a lucrative traffic which she had established with New England: while an express enactment prohibited the export of cattle, and even of cured meat and dairy produce from Ireland to England, lest the value of English farming-stock should be diminished by the competition. This indeed was an isolated act of narrow-minded tyranny; but tranquillity was no sooner re-established in England by the Revolution, than the same spirit of selfish monopoly began to influence the whole course of English legislation for Ireland. A great portion of the country is admirably adapted for sheep-farming, and Irish wool had a value second to no other in Europe. Manufactories of cloths began to arise in different parts of the country. 'Great numbers of English, Scotch, and even foreign manufacturers came over and settled in Ireland. Many thousands of men were employed in the trade, and all the signs of a great rising trade were visible' (ii. 209). Mr. Lecky argues truly—

'If it was an object of statesmanship to make Ireland a happy country, to mitigate the abject and heart-rending poverty of its people, and to develop among them habits of order, civilisation, and loyalty, the encouragement of this industrial tendency was of the utmost moment. If it was an object beyond all others to make Ireland a Protestant country, the extension of a rich manufacturing population, who would, for some generations at least, be mainly Protestant, would do more to effect this object than any system of penal laws or proselytising schools. Unfortunately, there was another object which was nearer the heart of the English Parliament than either of these. After the Revolution, commercial influence became supreme in its councils. There was an important woollen manufacture in England, and the English manufacturers urgently petitioned for the total destruction of the rising industry in Ireland.'

And this petition was complied with! Macaulay is never weary of extolling the statesmanlike wisdom of William III.; but surely his statesmanship was confined to foreign diplomacy and the formation of leagues for foreign war.¹ Yet Mr. Froude actually excuses the English Parliament, and represents its compliance with the prayer of this shameful petition, as a not unnatural punishment of the Irish House of Lords, for rejecting a Bill which had been passed in England 'for the security of his Majesty's person.' The Irish House of Commons had passed it; and both Commons and Lords passed the Association bond which accompanied it. But the Lords rejected some of the clauses which seemed to press too hardly on the Roman Catholics; and, in spite of their acceptance of the Association bond, this rejection was regarded as a proof that 'Ireland was determinately disloyal,' and that 'the only resource, therefore, was to keep her weak and miserable' (i. 261). Lord Macaulay finds a still stranger apology for the English policy, which he admits indeed to have been 'in principle altogether indefensible,' in the circumstance that 'the Act imposing restrictions on the exportation of woollen goods from Ireland was practically unimportant, inasmuch as prohibitions were not needed to prevent the Ireland of the seventeenth century from being a great manufacturing country, nor could the most liberal bounties have made her so. The jealousy of commerce, however, is as fanciful and unreasonable as the jealousy of love' (v. 55). And with a still stranger disregard of the duty of the ruling powers to endeavour to combine the different races in the island into an united nation, he contends that, unjust as the Act was, the 'Irishry' were not affected by it; and that the English colonists alone had a right to complain.

It is not easy to believe that both Houses of the English Parliament were mistaken when they represented to William the 'increase of the woollen manufacture in Ireland.' . . . 'The goodness of the materials for making all manner of cloth,' and the immigration of English into Ireland, for the

¹ Mr. Lecky points out that Lord Macaulay's account of the Parliamentary proceedings of 1689 and 1690 towards Ireland is not quite fair, since he passes over in 'absolute silence' the fact that a Bill, 'in its essential characteristics, precisely similar' to the Irish Act of Attainder, 'was passed by the English House of Commons; was passed with slight amendments by the House of Lords, and only lost by a prorogation; that other Bills with the same object were introduced in 1690, and 'the last passed the Commons December 23, 1690,' but was apparently lost also by the prorogation of Parliament before it came to the Lords (ii. 194-5).

purpose of carrying on and extending that manufacture.¹ And a better judge of such a matter than Lord Macaulay, Arthur Young, bears testimony to the correctness of their statement as to the facts; while, with a more patriotic statesmanship than the king himself, he is vehement in his condemnation of 'the narrow idea that the prosperity of the woollen fabrics of Ireland was inconsistent with the welfare of those of England;' and, writing in 1780, adds: 'It would at present be fortunate for both kingdoms if these errors had been confined to the last century.'²

It might, indeed, have occurred to men but moderately versed in the history of nations that, if a people were poor and disaffected, the way to convert its disaffection into loyalty was to turn its poverty into competency by the encouragement of profitable industry; but the jealousy of the English manufacturers, however unfounded, as Lord Macaulay regards it, or illiberal and unworthy, as Mr. Young pronounces it, was untiring; and, as has too often happened, the commercial interest was strong enough to prevail with the Government. The Act was passed. Even the promise made by William to counterbalance the depression of the woollen by the encouragement of the linen manufacture was violated. 'Not only was Ireland excluded from all participation in the bounties granted for the exportation of different kinds of linen from Great Britain to foreign countries, but Irish linens were entirely excluded from England by heavy duties, and absolutely excluded from the colonies' (L. ii. 212). So universal was the desire felt by English traders to crush all rivalry from Ireland, that petitions were even presented to Parliament, complaining of Irish fishermen for catching herrings on their own coast; and 'there

¹ The petitions of both Houses to William, with his answer, 'I shall do all that in me lies to discourage the woollen manufacture in Ireland, and to encourage the linen manufacture there, and to promote the trade of England,' are given by Arthur Young in his *Tour in Ireland*, Part II. 106-7.

² Strange to say, even at the present day efforts are made to check the growth of the manufacture of woollens, which has been revived with great success in some of the southern counties; and those by the very men whom every principle of common sense, as well as patriotism, should have induced to labour for its extension, the Irish landowners. The manufactures of frieze, and of cloths of the same fabric of the Scotch tweeds, have recently attained a high degree of excellence, and consequently of popularity. The Blarney tweeds of Mr. Mahony, of Blarney, equal the best productions of the Scotch looms. But the landlords of the district set their faces against the increase or enlargement of manufactories; even altogether refusing manufacturers land to erect such buildings, lest the increase of population which would thus be produced should in the end increase the poor-rates.

was even a party in England who desired to prohibit all fisheries on the Irish shore, except by boats built and manned by Englishmen.' To no purpose did Molyneux and Swift pour forth vehement remonstrances against restrictions which, as they truly said, had never been imposed upon any country, 'never heard or read of, either in ancient or modern story.' Whether out of revenge or out of jealousy, the object of keeping Ireland idle and poor was remorselessly persevered in; the Irish Parliament, from fear and hatred of their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, co-operating with the English Houses in this iniquitous and insane policy. And in one way it succeeded, if it produced mischievous and fatal effects in another.

'It appeared useless to persist' in any form of Irish industry, 'and a general commercial despondency prevailed. The leading manufacturers at once emigrated to England, to America, or to the continent. Many thousands of Irish Protestants took refuge in the colonies; and the possibility of balancing the great numerical strength of the Catholics was for ever at an end.'

One fruit of this legislation was not so much to extinguish competition as to invigorate a more dangerous rivalry. The prohibition of lawful trade naturally created illicit traffic. A smuggling trade with France sprang up and grew rapidly.

'Wool was secretly shipped from every Irish bay, a great impetus was given to the French woollen manufacture, which was the most serious rival to that of England, and another was added to the many powerful influences that were educating all classes of Irishmen into hostility to the law' (L. ii. 213).

Even this was not the whole of the evil. The destruction of profitable industry 'threw the whole population for subsistence on the soil,' which in so precarious a climate could not be relied upon to maintain them. The destitution became universal; 'in twenty years there were at least three or four of absolute famine.' Nicholson, Bishop of Derry, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury that—

'never, not even in Picardy, Westphalia, or Scotland, had he beheld such dismal marks of hunger and want; he dilates on the miserable hovels, the almost complete absence of clothing, and tells how, one of his carriage horses having been accidentally killed, it was surrounded at once by fifty or sixty famished cottagers, struggling desperately to obtain a morsel of flesh for themselves and their children' (*ib.* 216).

Both Mr. Lecky and Mr. Froude agree in attributing also to the jealousy of the English manufacturers the rejection of a proposal which, if it had been carried out, must, indeed,

have brought about not only the removal of those commercial restrictions, but with it the removal also of the ill-feeling which they had engendered, we mean the proposal of a legislative union with England; of a complete political incorporation of the three kingdoms. It is a strange specimen of political inconsistency that the very Administration which courageously and wisely forced union on the Scotch against their will, refused it to the Irish when they begged for it. No act of policy seems more utterly unaccountable. The leading Roman Catholics were not unwilling to acquiesce; and every class of Protestants, lay peers, bishops, members of the House of Commons, which formally petitioned for it, and, above all, the merchants and traders of every class, were eager for it. There is no sentence in Mr. Froude's three volumes with which we more fully agree than that in which he affirms that—

‘no excuse can be pleaded for Queen Anne's ministers, or for the English nation, whose resolution they represented, in rejecting these overtures of the Irish Parliament. The offered union was thrown away, when it would have been accepted as the most precious boon which England could bestow . . . was thrown away in the meanest and basest spirit of commercial jealousy. No rational fear of possible danger, no anxiety to prevent injustice, no honourable motive of any kind whatever can be imagined as having influenced Lord Nottingham or the persons, whoever they were, who were generally responsible for the decision. In fatal blindness they persuaded themselves that the union would make Ireland rich, and that England's interest was to keep her poor.’

And he brands the decision further, not only as a fatal rejection of an opportunity of terminating the existing grievances of Ireland, but as the cause and seed of fresh evils. ‘From this one act, as from a scorpion's egg, sprang a fresh and yet uncompleted cycle of disaffection, rebellion, and misery’ (i. 303). He truly adds that ‘opportunities occur in the affairs of nations which, if allowed to pass, return no more.’ History affords few more striking examples of this aphorism than that of the Irish Union. At the beginning of the last century it was, as we have seen, refused to the Irish when it might have been granted with graciousness, and would have been received with thankfulness. At the end of the same century it was forced upon them in spite of the most vehement resistance, by means which would have been absolutely discreditable had it not been so indispensable to the safety of both countries that the measure be carried at all hazards. And it is so far from having since produced that general satisfaction in Ireland which would have been its fruit

had it been granted when it was originally solicited, that throughout the two last reigns a clamour for its entire, or at least its partial repeal, has been constantly put forward by a body professing to be the peculiarly *Irish* party: and, though repudiated by the general good sense and loyalty of the vast majority of the nation, has furnished a host of noisy demagogues with an election cry, and a plea for keeping up a continued agitation as well in as out of Parliament.

The best parallel we can discover for the civil policy of England towards Ireland in the early part of the eighteenth century is its religious policy in the reign of Elizabeth. At a time when common sense would have dictated making the reformation popular by making it easy, legislation stepped in to forbid the use of the Prayer-Book in Irish, in order, forsooth, to compel the people to learn English. The contrary policy in Wales, prompted probably by Tudor partiality for the land whence sprang the royal race, made Wales a stronghold of Churchmanship, till the corrupt use of patronage by the Hanoverian dynasty in favour of alien Whigs, ignorant of the native language, left the Principality a prey to Dissent.

The one praise that can be given to the English Government of Ireland for the next three-quarters of a century, if indeed it be praise, is that it was consistent with itself. Even when Viceroys of high character and brilliant capacity were sent over, and there was more than one such, he was so hampered with instructions from England, and so completely regarded as a mere instrument to carry out the jobs of the Home Government, that he was powerless for good, and either sullenly acquiesced in measures which he disapproved, or endeavoured to save his reputation by deserting his post, and crossing over to England. For years absence from Ireland was the rule, residence at the Castle the exception. The celebrated Lord Carteret was one of the first who fixed his abode in Dublin: and his vicerealty was marked by the job which the genius of Swift has rendered the most notorious of all the malpractices in Irish history, Wood's patent, by which, to gratify the rapacity of one of the King's foreign mistresses, a Birmingham manufacturer was authorised to pour into the kingdom a mass of copper coinage tenfold as much as its trade required. Lord Chesterfield was another; and to his sagacity and energy the North of Ireland is mainly indebted for the extension and prosperity of her linen trade; which, though first established above a century before, had previously made but slow and fitful progress. In spite of the promise of Queen Anne's ministers to aid it, it had, as we

have seen, been discouraged and severely impeded by the same all-pervading appetite for monopoly of the English manufacturers which had extinguished the woollen trade. But Chesterfield had a clear perception of his duty to the people whom he was sent to rule, and an honourable ambition to distinguish his government by some real and permanent benefit to the nation. He arrived in Dublin in the summer of 1745, only a few days before the Chevalier Charles Edward landed in Scotland. The weak ministry of Pelham feared lest a large body of the Irish might espouse a cause which they identified with their religion; and at so critical a moment gave their new Lord Lieutenant freer liberty to carry out his ideas than he might otherwise have found. Under his discerning and resolute sway the English Government at last began to fulfil their promise to compensate Ireland for the destruction of her woollen trade by the encouragement of her linen manufacture. Linens were admitted free of duty into England; bounties were applied to promote their exportation to other countries: and so efficacious were these measures, that Belfast, the head-quarters of the trade, stigmatised a century before by Milton as a village 'in a barbarous nook,' and which in the last years of George II. contained less than nine thousand inhabitants, now almost rivals Dublin itself in population, and falls little short of the capital in its contributions to the revenue.

But, if Ulster began to thrive, the general condition of the country was still one of abject poverty and misery. Years of absolute famine, as we have seen, were not unfrequent. And it is strange to read that, while the people were starving, there was a large exportation not only of cattle, but of meat to France. Not that the growth of this trade, in Mr. Lecky's opinion, was an unalloyed benefit to the people. On the contrary, it aggravated the general distress by leading the landowners and farmers to convert arable land into pasture, a course which deprived the great bulk of the labourers of their ordinary employment. It may perhaps be questioned whether Mr. Lecky's arguments on this point are consistent with the genuine principles of political economy; and whether it can eventually benefit any nation to encourage production of a kind for which a land is less suited, at the expense of another for which soil and climate are more favourable. That every part of Ireland is better adapted for the cultivation of green crops than of grain is questioned by no practical farmer. But any sudden or rapid change must produce severe temporary distress among the class most affected by it; and un-

doubtedly numbers of the poor were thrown out of work, and for a while reduced to the most severe distress. What relief they found came not from the State, but from individual charity. In the famine of 1741, Archbishop Boulter 'fed thousands of the Dublin poor with meal for many weeks at his single expense.' Yet so inveterate is Mr. Froude against the English Church and Churchmen, that the very page which records this splendid munificence of the Archbishop, whose name is still honoured in Ireland, contains a sneer at both his profession, and a want of personal religion which he chooses to impute to him. 'Archbishop though he was, he was free from the cant of his profession. Throughout his voluminous correspondence the name of God scarcely appears, if at all' (i. 403, *note*). Yet he presently admits that 'there is scarcely a single sentiment in his most confidential letters at the publication of which he need have blushed,' and allows him to have been 'an eminently sincere man: upright, honourable, and straightforward; and, to the utmost of his ability, which was really considerable, he laboured for the true good of Ireland' (i. 610).

But the utmost endeavours of a single individual could do but little to alleviate such wide-spread misery. Elizabeth's poor-law had never been extended to Ireland, and it was only in Dublin and Cork that workhouses had been established, and a rate established for their support; while even the regulations of these charities were made curiously subservient to the prejudices of the governing authorities; and 'a very significant provision was made that the children of the Cork and Dublin workhouses might be exchanged, in order to prevent the possibility of Catholic parents interfering with the Protestant education of their children (L. ii. 254). For, if there were no enactments doing anything directly to relieve distress, there was a whole body of laws which indirectly increased it, by perpetuating the hostility between those of different religions, between the Protestants, of whatever denomination they might be, and the Roman Catholics. A wise Government would have striven to unite all classes, to keep religious divisions, which could not be prevented from existing, at least as much as possible out of sight; but the penal laws of Ireland seemed as if they had been studiously devised for the express object of perpetuating and embittering them, by forcing them on the notice of both Protestant and Roman Catholic in the most offensive manner; marking the superiority of the former in a way which could not fail to foster arrogance and injustice in the one, and fierce

discontent in the other. A Roman Catholic's power of acquiring land, of disposing of or even bequeathing any that he did possess, was carefully limited and hampered by the most vexatious restrictions. The law even invaded the peace of families by enacting that if the son of a Roman Catholic landowner became a Protestant he might claim a portion of his father's estate even in his lifetime. A Roman Catholic might not possess arms. In some towns even the number of Roman Catholics who might own or rent houses was limited. Against the clergy the code was still more oppressive. No bishop, or priest, or member of a monastic order was allowed to come into the island without a licence, nor to remain there without a registration which required periodical renewal. Large rewards were held out to any informer who should procure the conviction of any violator of the statute.¹ Such a state of affairs was fatal to the permanent tranquillity of any country; and we may believe that some of the efforts which in the last decade of the reign of George II. were made to organise a Parliamentary opposition to the Government, were inspired by the perception of a general discontent which was favourable to any kind of resistance. They did not at first produce any direct fruit, though they were led by men of no less weight than Mr. Boyle, the Speaker, and the Prime Sergeant, Mr. Malone, whom Mr. Lecky describes as 'a man of great genius, and by far the foremost lawyer and orator in the assembly' (ii. 431). For it was not easy to resist the power of the Castle while the Parliament only met every second year, and while the same Parliament might be continued through an entire reign. But the disposition thus shown to question the conduct of both the English and the Irish administration may probably have prompted the gradual relaxation of the penal laws during the ministry of the Duke of Newcastle, and under the viceroyalty of the Duke of Bedford. Encouraged by his lenity, the Roman Catholics themselves

'began to organise and take measures for obtaining a removal of their disabilities. Three men of considerable ability, Curry, O'Connor, and Wyse, appeared in their ranks,' and though 'there were occasional menacing symptoms of reviving persecution, . . . on the whole, the position of the Catholics in the last years of George II. was evidently improving. Religious fanaticism had greatly subsided. A new line of party division was forming. . . a spirit of nationality had arisen, which, though as yet very feeble, and deeply impregnated with baser

¹ In a law case in 1759 a Roman Catholic was reminded from the Bench that the laws did not presume a Papist to exist in the kingdom, nor could they breathe without the connivance of the Government.

motives, could not fail, sooner or later, to be advantageous to the great majority of the people' (L. ii. 437).

Here for the present Mr. Lecky leaves us. His two volumes end with the accession of George III. And, though Mr. Froude's work carries on the story to the end of the century, it is so plain that his view of the transactions of 1782, of 1798, and of those connected with the accomplishment of the Legislative Union, and still more his estimate of the characters of some of the leading Irishmen of the period, and especially of Grattan and Flood, are widely different from that which will be put forth by the more recent writers, that it seems better to abstain from considering his last two volumes by themselves, and to pass on to the proceedings of the present century and of the present reign.

The Union had removed one difficulty from the path of the governors of Ireland; but the religious differences, which were in a great degree the cause of all other difficulties, still subsisted with all their old animosity; if it may not even be said that the ill-feeling was increased by the partial relaxation of the restrictions imposed on the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholics were stimulated to greater efforts by the hope of obtaining more, the Protestants by their zeal to prevent any additional indulgence. We need not repeat the story of the statesmanlike attempt of Pitt to place the two religions on an equal footing. The cunning of an unscrupulous Scotch lawyer, whose sole religion, like that of Nanty Ewart, consisted in a Presbyterian hatred of Popery, working on the over-tender conscience of the King, contrived to defeat it for a time. But it was plain that a victory so won could not be lasting, and the Catholic question continued for nearly thirty years to be the chief difficulty of every administration. It broke up a second ministry, it impeded the arrangements of every Cabinet by which that Government was successively replaced, and, what was worst of all, when at last the question was settled by what is commonly known as the Emancipation Act, the Minister who carried the abolition of the restrictions yielded to necessity so reluctantly, and was so perplexed by the vehemence of the opposition which he had to encounter, not only in Parliament, but in the Royal closet also, that he left the Act incomplete; and, though the measure which he originally proposed to the King had embraced a clause for rendering the Roman Catholic clergy State stipendiaries, he was prevailed on to omit it with the result that Emancipation has only added to the difficulties of governing Ireland, instead of terminating them.

The endowment of their clergy had not only been a prominent part of Pitt's intended policy towards the Roman Catholics, but it was an arrangement which, if not overtly desired by the priests themselves, was one which they had repeatedly intimated their willingness to accept, if it were coupled with the removal of their disabilities. And it might have been thought that the proposed abolition of the existing restrictions made such a step more desirable than ever. If political power were to be given to the Roman Catholics, the first great object of every statesman should surely have been to obtain some security for power being used for the support of legitimate authority, not for the disturbance of the Imperial Government which had given it. And no such guarantee could have been found equal to that which would have been furnished by the State itself becoming the paymaster of the body, whose influence over their flocks, or, at all events, over the more numerous portion of them, was known to be as predominant in civil as in spiritual matters. The Duke of Wellington certainly saw this, but, as we have seen, he disliked the measure altogether, never, perhaps, more than when he was compelled to adopt it, and was, therefore, comparatively indifferent about making it complete, if by leaving it incomplete he could disarm a portion of the opposition by which he was more irritated than might have been expected of one generally so calm and magnanimous.

The consequence was not only that it failed to pacify Ireland, but that it did not even conciliate the very class who had received the benefit. On the contrary, their leader, as if anticipating the doctrine of Mr. Froude that lenity and indulgence are always to be ascribed to fear, almost from the first proclaimed that he and those of his sect owed no gratitude to the English Government or the English Parliament, and began to agitate for further concessions, even for such as were incompatible with the prosperity, if not with the safety of the empire.

Still, the English Ministers felt that they were bound to labour for the prosperity of Ireland. The maxim, as foolish as it was wicked, of Anne's time, that it was for the interest of England to keep Ireland down, had long been repudiated, and replaced by the wiser doctrine that the interests of the two principal component parts of a great empire were necessarily identical and inseparable. This had been Pitt's interpretation of his celebrated quotation :—

‘paribus se legibus ambæ
Invictæ gentes æterna in fœdera mittant.’

But the failure of the Emancipation Act to extinguish agitation had taught them one thing: that the road to the prosperity of Ireland was not to be found in making the Roman Catholics the masters of it. Mr. Froude, in a vigorous denunciation of the weak 'enthusiasm which believes that Ireland can be governed upon Irish ideas' (i. 165), has shown that this phrase, in the view of those who use it, means Roman Catholic ideas, and Roman Catholic ideas mean those of the priesthood, whose steadily pursued object is to prevent the laity from having any ideas at all. On all matters connected with religion they require implicit obedience, and few indeed are the subjects which they do not contrive to connect with their notions of religion. But, in 1832, the Ministry which had just carried the Reform Bill, flushed with their success, conceived that they were in a position to grapple with this difficulty; that the improvement of the condition of Ireland was to be sought in measures which should not benefit the Roman Catholics exclusively, but which should give all sects throughout the country an equal share of their advantages. And of all such measures the first seemed to be the establishment of an improved system of education.

It was no new idea. As far back as the reign of Henry VIII. the English Parliament had made a law that every incumbent in Ireland should maintain a school in his parish. As the enactment was at first but little regarded, it was repeated by the Parliaments of Elizabeth, of William III., and of George I., the latter of which gave the schools a better chance of success, by endowing the schoolmasters with a small portion of land. But the schools did not succeed; partly, in the opinion of judges neither incompetent nor uncandid, because they were under the sole direction of the Protestant clergymen, who avowedly used them as instruments of proselytism; partly because among their objects was the discountenancing of the Irish language, to which the lower orders of Irish were greatly attached. And the failure of the existing schools was so notorious that in 1733 the Primate, the benevolent Archbishop Boulter, of whom we have previously spoken, headed a numerous body of prelates and lay nobles in a petition to the reigning Sovereign that he would incorporate a fresh Society for the purposes of education. By Walpole's advice the petition was graciously listened to, a chartered Society was incorporated, by which schools were established in every county. But they failed also, it may be said even more conspicuously than the parish schools. Again, one cause of failure clearly was that by the very intention of those who had petitioned for their

foundation they also were proselytising institutions. The very words of the petition had mentioned 'the education of Popish and other natives;' and the education to be given was such as, in the words of one of the archbishop's letters, 'should bring the children of the Papists over to our Church.'

But the working of these schools contributed far more to ensure their failure than even the original vice of the principle on which they were founded. The first inquiry made into their condition was carried on by the illustrious philanthropist, Howard, who, in the course of his travels to investigate the state of the prisons of the country, was not unnaturally led to examine into that great feeder of all prisons, the ignorance of the people and its causes. A report which he made to a Parliamentary Committee in 1784 was a strong and sweeping condemnation of the schools in every respect; and a whole series of Commissions of Inquiry, appointed at intervals during the next forty years, only confirmed his statements, with even an aggravation of their worst features. With very few exceptions, the schoolmasters were incompetent, dishonest, and entirely neglectful of their duty. In some schools the pupils, instead of being taught even their letters, were employed in tilling plots of land for the master. In others the master never came near the pupils at all, but, devoting his whole time to the care of his farm or his shop, left the children to an usher, often a man destitute, not only of the knowledge requisite for a teacher, but of common humanity. The examiners, though, we are ashamed to say, clergymen of the Established Church, were as indifferent to their duties as the masters. They were required to make a monthly return of the state of the schools under their inspection. Probably they held no examinations: certainly they made no such returns. At last, in 1824, the report of a new commission, the fifteenth report presented to Parliament since the Union, was so condemnatory of the schools in every particular, that the Parliamentary grants for their support were reduced to a very small sum, and presently discontinued altogether.

They were not, indeed, the only schools in Ireland. James I. has sometimes been described as having the soul of a schoolmaster; and so far as it is an accusation (it would be well for him if he had no heavier misdeed to answer for), it may seem in some degree borne out by the care which he took, while peopling Ulster with agriculturists, to provide for the education of generations to come by founding schools, known from their patron as Royal Schools, at five cities or towns in Ulster—Armagh, Dungannon, Enniskillen, Cavan,

and Raphoe—to which Charles I. added one at Carysfort, in Wicklow, and one at Banagher, in King's County. But even these institutions could not be said to succeed, if success meant a fulfilment of the object of their foundation. They were richly endowed: the rentals of their estates amounting in the reign of William IV. to nearly 7,000*l.* a year; they were open to all classes and sects. But the Roman Catholics persisted in regarding them as seminaries of Protestantism and proselytism; even the scholarships and exhibitions offered to deserving scholars of small means failed to attract competition; and in 1835 the entire number of free scholars in the seven schools fell short of two dozen. There were, indeed, other pupils in sufficiently fair number, but they, as private boarders in the master's house, or as day boys, paid fees quite beyond the means of the lower middle class, whom it was the most desirable to attract. Nay, though according to the terms of their foundation, the schools were open to all, the masters refused to take Roman Catholics as boarders or day boys, believing probably that their presence would deter Protestant parents from sending their sons. Still one or two of them have certainly done good service in supplying the want of public schools in Ireland, which was destitute of such as England reckons public schools till the foundation of S. Columba's. The only schools in the whole island which could be pronounced really successful for the objects in behalf of which they had been set up were some grammar-schools which Erasmus Smith, a London alderman, in the reign of Charles II., had established in different parts of Ireland, where he had obtained grants of land. As the estates which he left for their endowment rose in value, other schools were opened by his trustees, till, a few years ago, they amounted to eighty-nine in number, with 11,000 children. But even these a very careful inquirer into the subject pronounced to be 'more or less mismanaged,' and would not allow them to form any exception to the broad assertion that 'in Ireland all endowments, both public and private, have worked badly;' ¹ one chief cause in every instance being, as he believed, that, even when the greatest pains were taken to veil it, the system adopted was one of religious exclusion.

Happily, the Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1833, Mr. Stanley (the late Lord Derby), was a man of keen perception and unflinching resolution. He not only saw that religious divisions were at the bottom of many of the worst evils of Ireland, but he also forecast a statesmanlike mode of grappling

¹ Godkin's *Education in Ireland*, p. 43.

with some of their most salient manifestations. He determined to substitute a system of mixed education for the previous one of exclusion, and established a Board of National Education at Dublin, on principles so tolerant that even a Roman Catholic prelate did not refuse to take his seat at the Board.¹ The National Schools were placed under its superintendence; fresh schools were opened in great numbers; and so judiciously did its regulations show that there was no desire to force the religious doctrines and practices of Churchmen on the Roman Catholics, that Roman Catholic children began to pour in as pupils; and the Commissioners, after nine years' experience, could venture to report that they were succeeding in teaching all classes and sects, 'by lessons both of precept and of habit, that religious differences should not prevent civil concord.' In referring with satisfaction to the results of the 'national' system of education in Ireland, we are of course only thinking of the exceptional condition of that anomalous country. As a general rule, and particularly for England, we hold that denominational education impartially succoured by the State is not only most sound in principle, but that practice proves it to work most satisfactorily. We are neither writing politics nor ethnology, so we are not concerned to explain why Ireland should not be as England in this respect. With this single remark we leave the question—religious differences in England are not combined with differences of race involving the 'earth-hunger.'

To be sure the organisers of the Irish National system were so far from wishing to exclude religion from their system, that the most noteworthy of all their class-books was a series of Scripture extracts in a new translation, out of which Romanist, Protestant (*i.e.* Anglican), and Presbyterian were able without conscientious scruple to study in common. At the same time it would not be candid to conceal the fact, which is cheerfully avowed by all who speak from local knowledge, that by efflux of time the schools have practically become denominational, according to the religious complexion of each district.

But Archbishop Murray could not live for ever; and on his death in 1852, his successor, Dr. Cullen, now a Cardinal and the chief dignitary of the Romish Church in Ireland, instantly reversed his conciliatory policy, issuing a pastoral, in which

¹ Out of seven Commissioners one was Archbishop Murray, and another was the Chief Remembrancer, Mr. A. Blake, both Roman Catholics. The others were Archbishop Whately, the Duke of Leinster, and Dr. Sadleir, Churchmen; Mr. Holmes, a Unitarian barrister, and Mr. Cuchill, a Presbyterian minister.

he denounced some of the school-books which Dr. Murray had approved, and for which he had even obtained the sanction of Pius IX., 'reprobated the project of giving a united religious instruction to Catholic and non-Catholic children in the same class,' and insisted that 'separate religious instruction was the only protection for Catholics.' Even members of his own religion differed from him; for Mr. Kavanagh, the Head Inspector of National Schools, cordially attested the success of the system of united education, short as the period had been of its operation; stating, in his evidence before a Committee of the House of Lords, 'that there had been a decided improvement in the country through its impartial working;' and that, 'as the children of different creeds became acquainted with each other, they learnt to entertain more kindly feeling towards each other.'

Above twenty years before, one of the ablest of the Roman Catholic prelates, Bishop Doyle, had predicted not only that such would be the effect of united education, but that no other system could possibly have the same result. A sentence of his evidence in 1830 before a Committee of the House of Lords is worth quoting:—

'I do not see how any man wishing well to the public peace, and who looks to Ireland as his country, can think that peace can ever be permanently established, or the prosperity of the country ever well secured, if children are to be separated at the commencement of life on account of their religious opinions. I do not know any measure which would prepare the way for a better feeling in Ireland than uniting children at an early age and bringing them up in the same school, leading them to commune with one another, and to form those little intimacies and friendships which often subsist through life. Children thus united know and love each other as children brought up together always will; and to separate them is, I think, to destroy some of the finest feelings in the hearts of men.'

No one ever questioned the strict orthodoxy of Bishop Doyle, his thorough understanding of all the principles, and his earnest zeal for the interests of the Church to which he belonged. Yet even he could detect nothing in the system of united or mixed education at variance with his views of religious duty. It is not unreasonable to believe that the realisation of Bishop Doyle's anticipations which was already witnessed in every part of Ireland, had influenced the Government of the day in their resolutions to carry the principle further, and to extend it to a higher class, and to students of maturer age. There was as yet no open university or college in Ireland. Dissenters, Protestant or Roman Catho-

lic, had, indeed, in the last decade of the eighteenth century, been admitted at Trinity College, and had been allowed to obtain degrees. But the scholarships and fellowships were confined to members of the Established Church; so that there was but little inducement for those of any other sect to avail themselves of the opening of the lecture-rooms; to which it may be added that the system was too costly for the majority of the Roman Catholics or Presbyterians, who, for the most part, were of a poorer class than the Episcopalian gentry. Maynooth, though exclusively Roman Catholic, was confined to students preparing for the priesthood.

The combined influence of these considerations suggested to Sir Robert Peel, in his second ministry, the foundation of new colleges in the different provinces, where university education, being made cheaper by being brought home, as it were, to the inhabitants of each, should be placed within reach of those whose narrow circumstances had hitherto debarred them from such an advantage; and where, moreover, the members of each religious sect might be brought together and from uniting in their early years in the same pursuits, both of study and of amusement, might, in their mature age, continue as men the friendly intercourse and cordial co-operation of their youth. Accordingly, in May, 1845, he proposed to Parliament the establishment of three colleges, one at Belfast for Ulster, one at Cork for Munster, and one at Galway for Connaught. Leinster, it was considered, was sufficiently provided for by Trinity, with which it seemed more prudent not to interfere. The education was to be most comprehensive, embracing all the most important branches of literature and science, except theology; while, a not insufficient provision was made for the separate moral and religious supervision and instruction of the students of each denomination. The scheme did not embrace the erection of rooms for either professors or students. But lodging-houses for the reception of the latter were to be licensed by the Presidents; and clergymen of each denomination were to be appointed with the title of Deans of Residence, to take charge of the pupils of their persuasion, to watch over their conduct, and to give such religious instruction as might consist with the other arrangements of the colleges.

The inducements to youths of limited means to avail themselves of the advantages offered to them were framed in a spirit of great liberality. There were, indeed, no fellowships, such as the English universities find so valuable, both as rewards for high attainments, and as a means of cherishing

the lifelong attachment to their Alma Mater, which is so prominent a characteristic of Oxford and Cambridge men. But above fifty scholarships were founded at each college, to which prizes for composition in English and Latin have been gradually added ; while a degree of the first or second class is not a barren honour, as in England, but brings with it a substantial reward of money. It is probably no exaggeration to say that a scholar who closes his career with a first-class degree may have received the whole of his three years' education without costing his parents a single farthing.

Peel's proposal was resisted by a strong party, with O'Connell as its mouthpiece, among the Roman Catholics, whose clergy were conscientiously and immovably opposed to any proposal withdrawing any part of the education of the youth of their persuasion from the control of their priests ; as well as by a small body of Churchmen, who, justly regarding religious instruction as the most valuable portion of education, disapproved of the then strange and novel phenomenon, its entire omission from the curriculum of the Queen's Colleges as objectionable in principle. The opposition, however, failed in gathering any Parliamentary strength ; the Colleges were founded and opened in the autumn of 1849, and from the first it was seen that, though the ecclesiastical chiefs of the Roman Catholic Church denounced them, there was a large party among their flocks which did not share their feelings. Two Roman Catholics of eminence, one being a priest, accepted the presidencies of the colleges at Cork and Galway ; several others competed for and obtained professorships ; and Roman Catholic pupils sought matriculation in numbers which bore a very fair proportion to those of the different forms of Protestantism, if it be recollected that in the southern and western provinces the vast majority of the Roman Catholics is composed of men of the very poorest class, equally unable to appreciate the value of the best, or to afford the very cheapest education.

And this willingness of Roman Catholics to avail themselves of the advantages thus offered to them was not a temporary feeling created or sharpened by novelty. On the contrary, their numbers have continued steadily to increase in at least as great a proportion as those of any other denomination. At present they equal the members of the Church of Ireland, and they fall very little short of those of all the different branches of Presbyterians taken together,¹ while

¹ The Presbyterians in Ireland are divided into the regular Presbyterians, the Non-subscribing Presbyterians, and the Unitarians, who likewise class themselves as Presbyterians.

it may be confidently affirmed that this union of youths of different denominations has been attended by the result which Bishop Doyle regarded, and which, indeed, every statesman and patriot must agree with him in regarding, as one of the very highest importance. It has implanted a friendly feeling between them all, which formerly there was nothing to call forth, and much to check, and as time goes on we believe that it will prove an efficient factor in that difficulty of statesmen, the pacification of Ireland. There is no doubt, as we have already hinted, that they were founded upon the worldly and unsatisfactory principle of raising a 'Universitas' from whose formal course of studies the 'Queen of sciences' was excluded. All honour then is due to the conscientious consistency of that band of Churchmen who protested against these 'godless Colleges,' as O'Connell and Sir R. Inglis combined to call them. Still Ireland, with its miserable divisions, and after the collapse of concurrent endowment, could only be dealt with by some such device; and it may on the whole be concluded, with thirty years' retrospect to guide us, that it would have been difficult at the time to hit off any other workable project. Besides, as we have indicated, Peel's plan comprised machinery enabling the churches to supply for themselves the missing religious machinery. Their failing to avail themselves of this provision is no proof that it did not form a religious element in his calculations, or that, if they had chosen, they might not easily have worked it.

With regard to what was, of course, the more immediate and direct object of the founders, a candid examination of proved facts will show that, considering that these colleges may still be regarded as an infant institution, they have also had a degree of success, as places of education, which may well be considered satisfactory by all who are acquainted with the general condition of the country. We only wish, as we have already hinted, that they had not been more extensively used as, so to speak, the secular branch of a complete education in which religion held its own. Their scholastic efficiency has been greatly impeded by the great absence of what are called 'intermediate schools,' preparatory schools, that is to say, in which pupils may be qualified to pass the matriculation examinations, and to profit by the more advanced teaching of the professors. The present Government has shown itself alive to the deficiency by passing, during the last Session, an Act for appropriating a million out of the surplus of the dis-established Church to the promotion of intermediate education in Ireland, by the double bonus of prize scholarships and

of payments for results to the managers of the schools which have turned out the successful scholars. This measure has had the singular good fortune, most singular indeed in Ireland, of pleasing all parties. Introduced first in the House of Lords, it has been approved of by Liberal as well as Conservative Peers ; it has been praised by Roman Catholic Peers, who are presumed to speak the sentiments of their hierarchy, and who cordially accept it as affording the best solution practicable of the difficulty of reconciling the authority claimed by their clergy in matters of education, with what must for Ireland be now accepted as the State principle of undenominational education. To have thus united all suffrages except those of a few fanatics, who have been just demonstrative enough to prove their own impotence, is a legislative triumph of which any Ministry might well be proud. Even Mr. Gladstone stood up to bless the boldness with which it put aside the objects to which he had in his disestablishing Act devoted the surplus. And the unanimity of friendly approval with which the measure has been received is not only a favourable omen of, but is of itself a very powerful contribution towards, its success. We sincerely hope that it may prove as efficacious as its framers desire and anticipate. This good result will be helped by the fact that the Queen's Colleges have already to some extent supplied the want themselves ; while among the indirect benefits which the country has derived from these institutions may be reckoned the stimulus which they have given to education throughout their respective districts. New schools have been founded, old schools have been re-opened. At Belfast, too, the Presbyterians and the Wesleyans have, to their credit, founded theological colleges for youths intended for the ministry in their respective churches, with the express design of taking advantage of the adjoining Queen's College.

There is no reason that the Church, which has of late years made a remarkable start in Belfast, should not secure its own advantages out of the presence of the local college. We may say the same of Cork, while Galway no doubt must for practical purposes be considered as virtually a Roman Catholic town. The three colleges number at present above 800 undergraduates ; and, though they were founded for Irish students only, some pupils are attracted from the other side of S. George's Channel. Names of Lancashiremen, of Welshmen, of Cornishmen, and even of men from Scilly and the Channel Islands, are to be found in the College calendars. As to the classes from whom the students are drawn, not

only do professional men, the clergy, lawyers, and doctors of the different districts send their sons to the Queen's Colleges, the wealthier traders and shopkeepers following their example, but even small farmers and artisans have stinted themselves to procure for their sons, or in some instances even for themselves, the benefits of a collegiate education and the honour of an university degree. There have even been instances of working men laying aside their tools for a portion of each day to attend the necessary lectures, and, while still in the receipt of weekly wages, qualifying themselves for a place in the Honour list of graduates.

In 1876 the Government sent down a Commission to visit the three Colleges, and to report on their working. One of the Commissioners was that earnest Churchman, Mr. Osborne Gordon, of Christ Church, one of the most accomplished scholars and most experienced tutors of Oxford, and now a member of the University Commission. Another was Dr. Allman, who, in the higher branches of science, has made himself an eminent name as a professor at Edinburgh. And not only did they present a report in which they described the instruction given in all the Colleges as 'most excellent and most successful,' but, in private conversation with Sir M. Hicks-Beach, then the Chief Secretary for Ireland, who quoted their panegyric in a speech which he addressed to the University in the autumn of the past year, 'they expressed to him, he might almost say, their astonishment at the results of their investigation, and at the progress which had been made in the education of the students far beyond anything that they could have conceived to be possible in such comparatively new institutions.' In proof of the veracity of these gentlemen, students of the Colleges, after completing their course, have gained scholarships in colleges at Oxford or Cambridge, and have subsequently obtained places in the list of wranglers, or in the first class of the classical tripos; while in Civil Service competitions, both at home and in India, they have been as successful as, if not more so than, the pupils of any other single institution in the three kingdoms.

The Queen's University, which serves as the fountain of degrees for the Colleges, as is well known to all who interest themselves in Irish affairs, has been, still is, and no doubt still will be, fiercely opposed, both in and out of Parliament, by a section of the extreme Irish or Roman Catholic party among the Irish members. Although it is far from being unanimously disapproved of by the Roman Catholics, Cardinal Cullen and Archbishop McHale, as might be supposed, have

little love for the institution; but the University is warmly countenanced by several of the most eminent men of science among the Roman Catholic laity; while Roman Catholic judges are found in the Senate, and on the Boards of Visitors.

There is, we all know, much still to be done in and for Ireland—as in all other questions, so in that of education; but, if the diffusion of culture and the softening of party and religious animosities are essential towards fostering civilisation and refinement, contentment and prosperity, we think that their supporters can well claim, even from those who can allege well-founded objections to a system of higher education based upon a secular basis, to make allowances for the sad peculiarities of Ireland, and to give not only a fair, but a friendly trial to the Queen's University and Colleges in connexion with the new scheme of intermediate education. In particular, the Church of Ireland has hitherto been afraid of stretching out its hand to pluck advantages which circumstances have brought within its reach, and it is accordingly with no small pleasure that we have heard that S. Columba's College, the flourishing centre in Ireland of Church-like public-school education, is prepared with a stout heart and well-founded expectations to brace itself up for the prizes promised in the Intermediate Education Act.

ART. V.—CREEDS AND THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT.

1. *A History of the Creeds of Christendom, with Translations.* Vol. I. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, U.S.A. *The Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches.* Vol. II. *The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches.* Vol. III. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.)
2. *A History of the Christian Councils, from the Original Documents, to the close of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325.* By the Right Reverend CHARLES JOSEPH HEFELE, Bishop of Rottenburg. Vol. I. Translated by W. R. CLARK, M.A. Vol. II., A.D. 326 to A.D. 429. Translated by HENRY NUTCOMBE OXENHAM, M.A. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1871 to 1876.)
3. *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., of the Oratory. New Edition. (B. M. Pickering, 1878.)

CREEDS may be viewed as the expression of the Church's *mind*, as Liturgies are the expression of her feelings of devotion. There is a stage, accordingly, in the history of Churches, when their activity takes a doctrinal direction, just as at another (and probably an earlier) period, it finds its satisfaction in the elaborating of stately liturgies and significant ritual. At such a stage, the intellectual consciousness of the time—what the Germans call the *Zeitgeist*—occupies itself with the facts and reasonings upon which the Church has itself been founded. It looks at them in the character of intellectual truths, abstract or concrete, and sets itself to collect and to define, to systematise and to complete them. Such a period will be a symbolising or *creed-making* age, and will show itself evidently as such, to attentive examination. The fact is one which has not escaped attention, and the theories which have from time to time been proposed, in order to provide a philosophical explanation of the phenomena which such periods present, would seem to be attracting to themselves at the present time a considerable degree of attention. A complete view of the case must of course include both the divine and the human factors which combine to produce the total result; but on the present occasion we propose to limit ourselves to one side only, and to examine, so far as our space permits, *the human side* alone of that historic process by which the symbolic doctrinal statements of the Church of Christ were successively shaped. And (by way of preface to the specific subject afforded us by Dr. Schaff's industrious work) we will first examine the logical nature of the process by which a creed is thus produced and set forth and finally adopted, and to which, in point of fact, the Œcumenical Creeds are, as a general rule, due. We shall avail ourselves, in so doing, of the materials which have been laboriously brought together and classified in the works named at the head of this page.

This work of the investigation of doctrine with a view to its definite statement seems to us the special function of the devout intellect in the Church; and we may regard it as certain that the course of such a process is providentially guided and its issue shaped by God the Holy Spirit. For our present purpose the religious truths with which the collective intellect of the Church has thus to deal may be considered under two classes—*facts and inferences*. With the facts of sacred history, when once received *as facts*, the Christian intellect has but little actively to do. Certain of them were originally matters of revelation, but for later generations they all alike rest on testimony inspired and uninspired. The

Christian thinker has but to hand them on as he has received them, without increase or diminution. They are 'a fixed quantity' in almost all the Creeds, which embody them with little or no important variation, as may be seen to advantage in any of the tabular views given in Dr. Schaff's work.

But the facts are not facts only; they are also the groundwork of what we have called the class of *inference-truths*, and with regard to these the case is different. A practical *consensus* of opinion exists as to the chief facts of Gospel history among the great majority of Christians; it is with regard to the inter-relations of the acknowledged facts, to the necessary inferences from them, to the practical methods for giving them effect in the world, that the divergence of minds finds its points of departure. It may be thought, and, indeed, it has often been said, that here is a great danger for the Church. Unquestionably experience has proved this to be the case; and it may be charitably supposed that something like this was what a famous putter-forth of daring paradoxes, Mr. J. A. Froude, meant by a *dictum* which even for him was irreverent, that while 'God gave the Gospel, the father of lies invented theology.' A cavil so flippant and so shallow cannot be too severely condemned, but it is possible that the writer had this notion at the bottom of his sneer. The lamentable consequences of this doctrinal divergence have, in fact, been experienced, and are visible in the state of division and estrangement in which the several sections of that once undivided body now exist. It may be thought, further, that the danger was one that might have been avoided, if a complete and detailed Creed embracing both facts and dogmas had been given to the Church by revelation or Apostolic authority. The germ of such a 'form of sound words,' which the Apostles themselves were accustomed to set forth, may indeed be discerned, as is well known, in more than one part of their writings; but it is a characteristic of most of these to be rather *memoranda* of facts than expressions of *doctrinal* truths. And it is clear, that to impose a detailed Creed from above, would have been to avoid one danger by introducing another. The certainty of mental and spiritual immobility is far worse than the danger of disagreement. Mohammedanism shows the fatal effects of a Creed stereotyped from the first and incapable of change: and we can hardly fail to find a warning in the spectacle of the blight of mental feebleness and stagnation which lies to this day upon every nation that has accepted the Korân as its unchangeable law. And, furthermore, the revelation of such a Creed would have been con-

trary to the entire analogy of the Divine dealings with the human race.

We hold, therefore, that the sanctified intellect has rightly and legitimately the share of activity which history shows that it unquestionably has exercised, in the gradual evolution of the Divine Thought from the earliest and least differentiated forms; from the dimness of *implicit* reverence to the clearness and sharp definition of *explicit* belief. Thus Dr. Newman well says as to the general idea of the evolution of doctrine:

‘Unless, then, some special ground of exception can be assigned, it is as evident that Christianity, as a doctrine and worship, will develop in the minds of recipients, as that it conforms in other respects, in its external propagation or its political framework, to the general methods by which the course of things is carried forward.

‘Again, if Christianity be an universal religion, suited, not simply to one locality or period, but to all times and places, it cannot but vary in its relations and dealings towards the world around it—that is, it will develop. Principles require a very various application, according as persons and circumstances vary, and must be thrown into new shapes, according to the form of society which they are to influence. Hence all bodies of Christians, orthodox or not, develop the doctrines of Scripture. Few but will grant that Luther’s view of justification had never been stated in words before his time; that his phraseology and his positions were novel, whether called for by circumstances or not. It is equally certain that the doctrine of justification defined at Trent was, in some sense, new also. The refutation and remedy of errors cannot precede their rise; and thus the fact of false developments or corruptions involves the correspondent manifestation of true ones. Moreover, all parties appeal to Scripture,—that is, argue from Scripture; but argument implies deduction—that is, development.’

It is, further, quite according to the analogy of the Divine dealings with men, as shewn in the history of the Jewish nation, that the formation of doctrine should be a gradual process, and that its development should be traceable. For it is unquestionable that the Messianic idea *grew* age after age among the prophets, not simply by accretion, but by orderly and organic development. This will become clear if we compare the germ of the Messianic portraiture, say, in Deut. xviii. 15, with its complete description and multiplied detail in the prophecies of Isaiah. Or again, we may take that which is in some respects an even more remarkable instance,—we mean the belief among the Jews in the immortality of the soul. To derive this, as some critics do, *ab extra*, is a mere begging of the question; so that we are thrown back on the supposition of a development of primitive ideas by the

collective mind of the prophets and psalmists of Israel, under the guiding influence of the Divine Spirit. The supposition of such a divinely guided organic growth, if admitted, would seem to us to go far to harmonise the statements of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which look professedly at the *divine* side of this process, and the element of truth which exists in the merely humanistic theories of the modern critical school of writers who regard the same facts simply as *human* developments from antecedent facts.

To such a process the gradual formation of Christian dogma has distinct analogies. And we may notice in passing certain incidental advantages, which appear to have resulted from the course thus taken by the Divine Providence. As a matter of faith we know (it need hardly be said) that the Divine method was abstractedly the best that could have been taken in the circumstances; we think also that as a matter of demonstration it may be *proved* to have been so. For thus Divine truth was filtered gradually forth upon the mind of the nations, as they were able to bear it, and not showered upon them all at once. One truth after another rose above the horizon of the human mind, and, by thus coming singly, secured attention and won acceptance. The acceptance was indeed usually preceded by a period of preparation, often by one of violent excitement and struggle. Not that this was always necessarily a thing to be deplored: it might not be a positive advantage, but still it might be a useful preliminary to the wide-spread acceptance of them: for thus truth after truth was impressed upon the mind of the Church as it could have been impressed in no other way.

It is clear, at the same time, that the process thus described has its limits, both of time and subject. It is a process that cannot go on indefinitely, heaping inference upon inference. It must be held in the strictest subordination to the original, and therefore fundamental, truths, of which it forms the organic development and necessary complement. This was no doubt what the framers of our Article VI. on the sufficiency of Holy Scripture intended to express by the words, 'so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby;' and that the warning was by no means unneeded is very evident from the mass of doubtful inferences and 'pious opinions' which a licence of development long unrestricted has produced in the Roman Communion. We should doubt very much the safety of, so to speak, a 'second generation' of the theological inferences. Inferences direct from Holy Scripture are one thing; but a new set of inferences, based only on our

former conclusions, is another and far more questionable thing. It may fairly be a matter of doubt how far *they* are in any sense necessarily reliable. The Church has possession of certain *facts* of religion; with respect to such she has the position of a *witness*. The Church contends further that certain *inferences* are virtually contained in the facts, and implied by them necessarily. With respect to these, her position is that of a *teacher* or *expositor*. This is the function of the *Ecclesia docens*. These instances of necessary inference constitute the tradition of the Church, which may fairly claim to stand for practical purposes side by side with Holy Scripture in respect of the cogency with which it applies to the reason and the will of the hearer. As an instance of the application of this principle may be adduced our own Bishop Pearson, in his *Exposition of the Creed* (art. v. chap. i. par. 4).

Thus it would seem that the process of evolving dogma needs to occupy itself primarily with the Holy Scriptures, and to find exclusively in them the materials for its labours. It must observe, in the extent to which they have spoken or have not spoken upon any particular point, the definite limit for its own operations. Experience has abundantly proved how much the speculative faculty needs the anchor and hold-fast which the Scriptures supply. An unlimited licence of introducing new articles into the Creeds would speedily submerge the primitive faith under a flood of purely human additions; and except this limit which the Scripture thus furnishes, we do not see where any boundary can logically be placed. Here appears to us the cardinal defect of so subtle a theory of development as that of Dr. Newman,¹ viz. that it postulates an infallible developing authority to preside over every step of the evolution of dogma, which, since it is infallible, is necessarily the judge of the limits of its own authority, and can itself be limited by no external authority whatever. His argument, then, comes to this, that any developments whatever are legitimate, if guaranteed by the (supposed) infallible authority. The infallibility, however, is neither proved nor can be proved. This would not necessarily be fatal to it, if in practice it should appear so to discharge its supposed function of a developing authority, as to arrive at doctrinal results agreeable to and harmonising with the portions of Christian truth previously reached and embodied. To our apprehension, however, this is not the case.

The view we have been dwelling upon is, it will be seen,

¹ Lately republished, and thus requiring notice as a book of the day.

different from this. We premise, not an infallible *authority* bestowed upon the Church, but the Divine guidance expressly promised to it in Scripture. Given these two things, the Christian consciousness employing itself upon the *substratum* of generic and fruitful religious ideas, which, when defined and technically expressed, become dogmas of the Church, and the Divine Spirit controlling its operations, it appears to us that the result of this balance of forces would be at once progressive and conservative; that it would be exactly what we have in the successive Œcumenical Creeds, that is to say, those which were authorised by the whole Church, and have been accepted by it, of which the Chalcedonian is, as yet, the last; viz. expositions of doctrine, keeping close to the Holy Scriptures, and yet clear where they are obscure; and systematic in method where they are popular in treatment.

But the Church so guided would have no power to go beyond the circle of primitive, *i.e.* *Scripture* truths, in search of materials for its generalisations. And assuredly the Primitive Church did not attempt to do so. It is the later, not the earlier, Church of Rome which was the first to arrogate to itself an unlimited power of adding fresh articles to the Creed.

What, therefore, is required is a principle that shall at once recognise the function of the sanctified intellect in the ascertaining of doctrinal truth, and at the same time prescribe the limits to the exercise of that function. We must bear in mind that truth is single and changeless, so that our use of the words growth or development does not denote an increment in the truth itself, but is only another way of stating that human minds have learned to see more of it; and remembering this, we have to lay down a rule that shall at once include primitive teaching, which consists of legitimate developments, and exclude those of the later Roman Church, many of which we must hold to be illegitimate.¹

Now Dr. Newman does, as we have said, lay down a theory of *development by an infallible authority*. He says:—

‘The very idea of revelation implies a present informant and guide, and that an infallible one—not a mere abstract declaration of truths unknown before to man, or a record of history, or the result of an antiquarian research, but a message and a lesson speaking to this man and that. This is shown by the popular notion which has prevailed amongst us since the Reformation, that the Bible itself is such a guide; and which succeeded in overthrowing the supremacy of Church

¹ We are glad to claim the Bishop of Winchester as holding the view expressed in the text. See p. 65 of his Charge for 1878 delivered since this article was in type.—[ED. C. Q. R.]

and Pope, for the very reason that it was a rival authority, not resisting merely, but supplanting it. In proportion, then, as we find, in matter of fact, that the inspired volume is not adapted or intended to subserve that purpose, are we forced to revert to that living and present Guide, which, at the era of her defection, had been so long recognised as the dispenser of Scripture, according to times and circumstances, and the arbiter of all true doctrine and holy practice to her children. We feel a need, and she alone of all things under heaven supplies it. We are told that God has spoken. Where? In a book? We have tried it, and it disappoints; it disappoints us, that most holy and blessed gift, not from any fault of its own, but because it is used for a purpose for which it was not given. The Ethiopian's reply, when S. Philip asked him if he understood what he was reading, is the voice of nature:—"How can I, unless some man shall guide me?" The Church undertakes that office; she does what none else can do, and this is the secret of her power. "The human mind," it has been said, "wishes to be rid of doubt in religion; and a teacher who claims infallibility is readily believed on his simple word. We see this constantly exemplified in the case of individual pretenders amongst ourselves. In Romanism, the Church pretends it; she rids herself of competitors by forestalling them. And probably, in the eyes of her children, this is not the least persuasive argument for her infallibility, that she alone of all Churches dares claim it, as if a secret instinct and involuntary misgivings restrained those rival communions which go so far towards affecting it." These sentences, whatever may be the errors of their wording, surely express a great truth. The most obvious answer, then, to the question, "Why we yield to the authority of the Church in the questions and developments of faith," is, that some authority there must be if there is a revelation given, and other authority there is none but she. A revelation is not given if there be no authority to decide what it is that is given.'—(P. 87.)

Now it must be observed that this argument is conducted by an illicit process in two directions. First, it confuses the function of the Church as a *witness* with a supposed function of evolving infallibly new articles of faith. Next, in other parts of the argument, the author finds himself constrained to allow 'the same infallibility as the Church' to the *Pope* (see chap. ii. sect. 2, p. 87 note). The interchange of these two notions is very like a case of 'undistributed middle.'

The Church is a witness of the Faith; and a trustworthy one. But the notions of trustworthiness and infallibility are distinct. A witness may be correct upon a particular matter of fact. It does not therefore follow that he is infallible upon all matters. So the Church of the second or of the third century is, it will be universally allowed, a competent witness as to the Tradition received from the Apostles in those ages. The Church of the tenth or of the nineteenth century is not less a competent witness upon that point. It

is made so by the *continuity of its teaching*, which has been put on record in a thousand ways, in every one of the intervening centuries, and is discoverable by the exercise of ordinary diligence and learning by such as are qualified for their work. Thus, then, the fact of a continuous existence and teaching renders the Church of any age a competent and trustworthy witness as to the question—What was the Gospel preached in the first ages of Christianity?—without thereby claiming any infallible authority at all.

In the second place, granting that an infallibility does, *juxta modum*, and in a certain very real sense, inhere in the Church, it does not apparently admit, in the nature of things of being transferred to the Pope, or even of being exercised by him, notwithstanding the decree of the Vatican Council. This will, we think, appear if we consider the nature of the Church's infallibility.

We need hardly say that there is no express record in the Scriptures of the bestowal of the specific gift of doctrinal infallibility upon the Church by its Founder. But a promise *was* given of immunity from complete and mortal error, and that promise seems to carry with it a guarantee of doctrinal guidance and protection from falling as a whole into heresy, which is all that the notion of infallibility appears necessarily to imply, though it is popularly taken to mean a good deal more. Thus, the two notions are exactly commensurate.

The Church is infallible in so much as it is indefectible. That is to say, the whole Church cannot entirely and finally fall from the faith: 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.' It is thus secure from complete denial of the faith. But this indefectibility of the whole does not apply to the parts *severally* and *separately* considered; each of which *may* conceivably err. Thus we must explain the nineteenth and twenty-first Articles. Bishop Pearson, indeed, taking the converse order, from the parts to the whole, argues that 'if all particulars be defectible, the universal Church must also be subject of itself unto the same defectibility' (*On the Creed*. Art. 'The Holy Catholic Church,' chap. i. § 16). And logically enough as far as his premisses went; but he takes care to render the conclusion harmless, by the *cautela* that they shall not perish *all at once*! The Universal Church is therefore indefectible, and if so, in a sense infallible. But it appears from the premisses that this infallibility cannot be predicated with certainty of any particular branch of the Church, at any time. It would appear, in consequence, that no single branch of the Church can exercise or transfer it.

Thus it is not a power of speaking at all times correctly and accurately on theology, though this is the meaning popularly attached to it. In other words, it is not a *privilege*, which may be exercised by a person; but it is a *property* inhering in an institution:—the property, *i.e.* of essential inerrancy, which inheres in *the whole* institution, and must not be predicated of its parts. The whole Church cannot, even if it would, divest itself of its property of inerrancy any more than snow could transfer its property of whiteness.

It would seem, therefore, to follow, that as, though there is a promise of indefectibility given to the whole Church, there is no such promise to any particular branch, so, though there is a general superintending Providence over the mind of the Church, guiding it eventually into the right channels and to an orthodox conclusion, yet that no particular Church is thereby guaranteed from error upon any point of doctrine during the process of its formation. There was a time during the Arian controversy, when well-nigh the whole Church found itself committed by its representatives to the heterodox formula of Rimini, and shuddered, as S. Jerome declared, to find itself Arian.¹

Following out this line of thought, it may be laid down broadly as a working hypothesis, that the facts of sacred history being given in the historical Scriptures, and the great lines of inference sketched out unmistakably in the later treatises of the Canon, *i.e.* the Epistles of S. Paul; the human intellect, under the ordinary guidance of the Divine Spirit, becomes adequate to draw out the logical consequences and cor-relatives of those primary truths with practical correctness. It cannot, indeed, be called an infallible instrument; it makes mistakes. But the view we are endeavouring to expound is that, in the providence of God, these aberrations compensate each other; and that the travail of the mind of Christendom upon the great problems of the Christian Faith arrives at the truth in the end.

If one age or one set of thinkers develop the Christian scheme in a one-sided way, another age or another set of thinkers corrects that tendency. The pendulum swings for a time, too far first to *one side* and then too far on the other, but it reaches a state of rest at length. The same thing may be said of the human mind at all events in its employment upon theological subjects. Its stages may be defined as

¹ '*Ingemuit totus orbis et Arianum se esse miratus est.*'—(*Dial. adv. Lucif.*) See also Hefele: *History of the Councils*, ii. p. 271.

being usually three. It conceives a subject vaguely at first; expresses it in figurative, popular, and approximate forms of words. Then by time and reflection the matter becomes clarified to the eye of the mind, and is drawn to a single issue or group of issues, generally contrasted more or less sharply. Between these it oscillates for a time, and ends by coming to rest between the two, or, if it chooses one of the alternatives, it is taken generally with a negative veto upon certain of the inferences deduced from it. Thus the mind of the Church may seem to have oscillated for a moment between the teaching of Arius and that of Athanasius. Each claimed to be an explicit development from the previous *implicit* belief. The question was, which was the *legitimate* development? And this was soon seen to be a most momentous question; for though, at their starting-point, the two were so nearly alike that a single Greek letter covered the difference in the expression of them,¹ yet it was soon seen that their consequences diverged so widely, as to constitute not one religion, but two. In like manner the Christian consciousness has at one period gravitated towards holding the truth of the Divine predestination, as a complete statement of the cause of human action; at another it has leant towards an unqualified statement of the free will of man as similarly complete. The eventual conclusion into which it is settling is doubtless a *tertium quid* or combination of the two. Dr. Mozley says thoughtfully:—

‘Upon this abstract idea, then, of the Divine Power, as an unlimited power, rose up the Augustinian doctrine of predestination and grace; while upon the abstract idea of free will, as an unlimited faculty, rose up the Pelagian theory. Had men perceived, indeed, more clearly and really than they have done, their ignorance as human creatures, and the relation in which the human reason stands to the great truths involved in this question, they might have saved themselves the trouble of this whole controversy. They would have seen that this question cannot be determined absolutely one way or another; that it lies between two great contradictory truths, neither of which can be set aside or made to give way to the other—two opposing tendencies of thought inherent in the human mind, which go on side by side, and are able to be held and maintained together, although thus opposite to each other, because they are only incipient, and not final

¹ The historian Gibbon says, according to his wont: ‘The Greek word which was chosen to express this mysterious resemblance bears so close an affinity to the orthodox symbol, that the profane of every age have derided the furious contests which the difference of a single diphthong excited between the Homoiousians and the Homoiousians.’—(*Decline and Fall*, chap. xxi. p. 339.)

and complete truths—the great truths, I mean, of the Divine Power on the one side, and man's free will, or his originality as an agent, on the other. And this is, in fact, the mode in which the question is settled by the practical common sense of mankind. . . . They imply that the doctrine of predestination and the doctrine of free will are both true, and that one who would hold the truth must hold both.'—*Treatise on Predestination*, chap. xi.

And we shall find hereafter how this law is constantly exemplified in the history of the successive controversies which have arisen in the Church respecting doctrine. But though controversy has been a constant incident of religious history, and thus in a certain sense the gradual modification of opinion was going on more or less rapidly at all times, yet it will be found that, as a matter of fact, any appreciable exercise of this evolving power is limited to particular times by latent but powerful causes, which work silently beneath the surface of opinion. In one age or century the efforts of thinkers are irresistibly directed to clear and systematise their conceptions; in another they rest content with the results already reached. The former, as we have said, will be the *symbolising, creed-making* age; the latter will make few or no additions to its stock of formulised religious truths.

It seems to us, if we look across the centuries which separate us from the Christian era, that there are two periods in which this spirit of symbolising was decidedly in the ascendant; and that there were only two.

The former, and vastly more important, extended throughout the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries A.D.; the latter embraced the great religious upheaval of the sixteenth and the earlier part of the seventeenth century.

We do not mean to say that activity about creeds is to be found at no time except during these two periods, or that the systematising faculty was entirely quiescent during the intervals. There were continual controversies on subordinate points of doctrine, even when the great questions of polemics had for the time been laid to rest. Some of the great theologians of later history—notably S. Jerome—lived their whole lives enveloped in a whirlwind of controversies. One great dispute—the Adoptionist—lies entirely outside both the periods we have named.¹ A similar remark may be made upon the Iconoclast dispute, which, however, had but an indirect

¹ It was, however, a survival from the controversies respecting the nature of the Divine Son, of which almost every point had been settled by the time of the Council of Chalcedon.

bearing upon doctrine; while the cycle of the Schoolmen might almost rank as a third period, only that its tendency was to the analysis rather than to the synthesis of theological truths, to exposition at large rather than to expression in brief; and that it produced no Creed. Its type is the *Summa Theologica* of S. Thomas Aquinas, which must be placed in a different category from the symbolic. The case of the Athanasian Creed again is a distinct one; yet it seems not unlikely that it may after all be traced back to the verge of the Athanasian age. But, speaking generally, we may say that the mass of the symbolical documents extant must be referred to one or other of the periods we have named; and it is to be noted that attempts made by individuals, however influential, at other periods, to add to the Confessions, have invariably proved abortive. Who, for instance, beyond the circle of students, has ever heard of that well-intentioned document, the *Henoticon*, issued by the Emperor Zeno? And how entirely wanting in effect were 'The Three Chapters,' though pressed upon the Church by so powerful a monarch as Justinian! It seems to follow that the Church really obeys a law of organic growth in these matters, which as it refuses to be hurried in the stages of its progress, so it cannot be greatly retarded.

For we may with great propriety regard the earlier age of symbol-making as having been long prepared for by the growth and conflict of ideas, and as having been brought on at length by the sense of an immediate need in the Church, which surely brought about its own satisfaction. The Church of Christ, in the order of Providence, was sent forth into the world with the *minimum* of actually formulised doctrine. The Apostolic tradition was mainly an *historical* one. It was a record of facts. These were interpreted in a particular manner; and so interpreted that more was implied in them than was recognised at first. The simple profession, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,' ascribed to the Ethiopian Eunuch, is a type of what Christianity was at this earliest epoch. The Church was satisfied for the moment with the great fact of the appearance of the Saviour—God and Man—and while assimilating it, needed little more: as a man, whom a beautiful garden delights, omits for the moment to explore the estate beyond it. Unquestionably, for catechetical and missionary purposes, some brief formula of doctrine would be required and supplied. We may, perhaps, find traces of one such form (as was pointed out by the late Dr. Neale) in 1 Cor. xv. 3-7, or in S. Paul's reference in another place to his well-

known 'form of sound words' (2 Tim. i. 13, 14), or in S. Peter's speeches¹ (which have every mark of being moulded on the same original) in Acts iii. 13-18 and v. 38-43. These, it will be seen, are one and all simply historical, or at most with deductions of the simplest and most obvious kind; the doctrinal element was to be the task of a later age.

Even of Apostolic Christianity itself the New Testament exhibits a Petrine and a Pauline type; and, before blending, they met, as we know, in sharp and decided conflict. Questions were raised, and left without permanent decision; and the ferment caused by such controversies had no sooner subsided than the still immature Church was brought face to face, as with new and greater difficulties of practice, so also with newer and vaster problems of thought. In the isapostolic age Gnosticism appeared, flourished, divided, and divided again: each and all of its varieties the deadly foe of Catholic theology, which in some countries, Arabia and parts of Syria, it succeeded at length in well-nigh supplanting. When we speak of Gnosticism indeed, we use a *generic* term. It was not one heresy, but a hundred. But one service it rendered most unwillingly to the Catholic theology. It *followed out a multitude of possible lines of thought*—we might say *all possible lines*; and thus, by proving their real nature and ultimate tendency, warned Catholics off them. The heresiarchs simplified the issues of thought, and thus contributed to the growth of Catholic theology. After Gnosticism, and doubtless provoked by it, rose in the second century Montanism; and this, though incidentally heretical, was mainly an emotional and sentimental movement. It stimulated and forced on the issues of theology, but itself contributed little or nothing to them, on one side or on the other. Finally, to pass over a multitude of partial or sectional forms of thought, the Arian heresy it was that finally precipitated the definitive struggle which issued, after two centuries had been occupied with the work, in the scientific and complete statement of the Christian faith in the formula of Nicæa, as finally supplemented and completed at the following Synods. A Creed was no new thing. There had been Creeds always. Baptismal or individual formulas there had existed in various types of wording and in great numbers. Dr. Schaff (vol. ii. pp. 11-40) enumerates *nineteen* of these; and further search would no doubt bring to light others. Indeed, the Roman and Aquileian forms, and the *Italica vetus*, are here set down in a subsequent

¹ Dr. Schaff (ii. 7) has overlooked these altogether.

section, as having special points of resemblance to the Apostles' Creed.¹

Many of these Creeds are singularly interesting. As a rule, they are strictly historical, and expressed (though often with considerable adaptation) in the phrases of Scripture; from which we infer that, as yet, the outward facts of the order of Grace sufficed for the intellectual and spiritual needs of the great majority of Christians. But in the Confessions of Faith drawn up by the thinkers and theologians of these early ages, there are observable distinct endeavours after a deeper comprehension and more accurate and definite expression of the articles of the Faith. This is specially observable in the Confessions of Irenæus, Origen, and S. Cyril. Take, *e.g.*, one of the Creeds found in the writings of the former (*Contra Hæres.* lib. i. cap. 10, par. 1).

Here we find a marked inartificiality of structure; the articles are *scattered*, those predicated of each Person of the Holy Trinity intermixed with others. A theological nomenclature had yet to be formed. Thus we have the miraculous Conception and Birth simply as *καὶ τὴν ἐκ Παρθένου γέννησιν*; the Passion, *τὸ πάθος*; the Resurrection from the Dead, *τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, *i.e.* the rousing: a popular and, so to speak, *undefined* notion, of quite a different order from the accurate and *theological* term *ἀνάστασις*. The first time that this latter term is found is apparently in the Creed which Eusebius of Cæsarea laid before the Council of Nicæa. It occurs virtually (*ἀναστάντα*) in the Nicene formula; and after that date it is usually employed. The Ascension, again, is *τὴν ἑνσαρκον (sic) εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Χρ. Ἰη.*, and so on. It is *discursive*, and some articles are expanded almost into homilies. This, however, is more apparent as the century proceeds, and with the Creed of Lucian of Antioch (A.D. 300) we are already in the thick of speculation, and each article becomes a theological treatise, expressed more or less in technical language, and with accurate and well-understood senses applied to all the terms.

The Creed which is found in the *Apostolical Constitutions* may be given here as a type of Creeds of this age:—

πιστεύω καὶ βαπτίζομαι εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν
παντοκράτορα,
τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

¹ Dr. Salmon's article on this subject, which has appeared since these pages were written, may be profitably consulted (*Contemporary Review* for August, 1878).

κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν πάντων,
 ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα
 καὶ εἰς τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν,
 τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ Υἱόν,
 τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως,
 τὸν πρὸ αἰώνων εὐδοκία τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα [οὐ κτισθέντα],
 δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, ὁρατά τε καὶ
 ἀόρατα·
 τὸν ἐπ' ἐσχάτων ἡμερῶν κατελθόντα ἐξ οὐρανῶν,
 καὶ σάρκα ἀναλαβόντα,
 καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου Μαρίας γεννηθέντα,
 καὶ πολιτευσάμενον ὁσῶς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς
 αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ σταυρωθέντα ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου,
 καὶ ἀποθανόντα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,
 καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,
 καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,
 καὶ κατεσθέντα ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς,
 καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος μετὰ δόξης,
 κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς,
 οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος·
 βαπτίζομαι καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον,
 τουτίεστι τὸν Παράκλητον,
 τὸ ἐνεργήσαν ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ἁγίοις,
 ὕστερον δὲ ἀποσταλὲν καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς,
 κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,
 καὶ μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ
 ἐκκλησίᾳ·
 εἰς σαρκὸς ἀνάστασιν,
 καὶ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,
 καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν,
 καὶ εἰς ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

The era of the Councils began at Nicæa, and each of the Œcumenical Councils put forth its own Creed: not necessarily, nor usually, an original one; on the contrary, the formula adopted at Nicæa became for later Synods morally obligatory, though they might make additions to it, and usually did so.

Their work was, as we have already noticed, to translate the well-known truths of the Faith into the language of scientific theology. Truths were by degrees felt to be insufficiently and insecurely held, *because they had not been defined*. A new Christian consciousness had grown up far more delicate and cultured, and therefore far more exacting; and this demanded to be satisfied.

The old reverent, child-like faith, more or less fragmentary as it was, was no longer sufficient for the learned scholars, the

keen thinkers, the earnest disputants who stood around the altars and filled the monasteries of that stirring and splendid fourth century. The Christian religion, still *new*, as the age of beliefs is counted, had now to undergo a new trial. It had already come forth the victor from repeated persecutions. It had gathered the poor into its fold from end to end of the Roman Empire. It had won a standing-ground for itself, and vindicated abundantly its right to exist. Persecution gave place first to connivance, then to open toleration, and, finally, to adoption of it by the Empire as the State religion. And then its dogmas came, as they had never come before, under the curious eye of the philosopher. Hitherto it had not been worth his while to undertake a careful and leisurely examination of the doctrines of the Church. Now and then a Neo-Platonist like Porphyry had arisen, or like the Epicurean Celsus, the antagonist of Origen, who had chosen to give a half-scornful attention to the new phenomenon of Christianity. But, as a rule, the learned class had not thought it worth while to do this; and Christianity was long reckoned what the Roman historian Tacitus called it, a dire superstition, fit only for common people or slaves. But when the popular belief became an inmate of the Imperial palace and made its way to the occupant of the throne itself, it became a phenomenon requiring more serious and respectful study. This, accordingly, many a keen thinker proceeded to give to its as yet undefined doctrines; and it is obvious to a very superficial scrutiny that not a few of the disputants, *e.g.* in the Arian controversy, were simply conforming philosophers, wielding their familiar dialectical weapons upon a novel subject-matter. All this told upon the character of the argument. It did not, of course, affect the result. The truth confessed at Nicæa had been the tradition of the whole Church from the beginning. But it had never been confessed before in those precise words. A scientific spirit had prescribed the forms of the argument and defined the terms to be employed. The keenest appreciation of grammatical niceties, and what they might be made to stand for, intensified the struggle between the partisans of ὁμοούσιος and ὁμοιούσιος. In fact, the questions of the new, *i.e.* the Christian, theology were not less philosophical than religious; and we need the less wonder that there were philosophers who were Christians, and Christians who were philosophers; or that in later times the sphere of theology became so extended as to cover all subjects of discussion; that theological premisses were made to serve as the foundation-stone of scientific arguments, and a supposed

contradiction to doctrinal positions operated as a *caveat* to the natural philosopher, as in the case of Galileo, against following to their natural conclusions his trains of thought. It followed from both these facts, therefore, first, that the Creed of Nicæa was set forth by a Council representing the whole Church, and next, that it was the outcome of the keen scrutiny applied to doctrine by so many able and cultured minds, that it became thenceforth the one authoritative Creed. The Fathers of Nicæa had no established formula set forth by Apostolic authority to appeal to. Had there been such, it can hardly be thought that they would have presumed to substitute one of their own in its place. But, in fact, though the Faith of the Churches was identical in substance, several Creeds were in use among them, and authority was not even claimed, so far as appears, for any one of these. It is this also, we may remark in passing, which is decisive against the literally Apostolic authorship attributed by legend to the Apostles' Creed. It must have been known to the Fathers of Nicæa, if current at that time. Yet it was apparently not even read in the Council, as some other Creeds were.¹ It belonged to the earlier class of baptismal or non-critical symbols; and this is true of all its forms earlier and later. The wide currency which, during the seventh and eighth centuries A.D., it obtained throughout the West, must be attributed to the growing influence of the Roman Church, whose special Creed it was.² There is no trace, however, of any formal or synodical action by which authority was given to it. It found its way early into all kinds of private and monastic offices, and thence into more authoritative forms. But it added nothing to the Catholic definitions: and none of its phrases are indexes to the gradual development of opinion in the Church. As Dr. Schaff says:—

‘If we regard, then, the present text of the Apostles' Creed as a complete whole, we can hardly trace it beyond the sixth, certainly not beyond the close of the fifth century, and its triumph over all the other forms in the Latin Church was not completed till the eighth century, or about the time when the Bishops of Rome strenuously endeavoured to conform the liturgies of the Western Churches to the Roman order.’—(Vol. ii. p. 19.)

For the crucial phrases which are the landmarks of past controversies, we must look to the Creed of Nicæa and Constantinople.

¹ Cf. Schaff, vol. ii. pp. 22–25.

² See Dr. Salmon's Essay, already quoted.

Upon the details of the Arian controversy, prolonged as it was, we need not enter, because it consisted mainly of repeated and still repeated assertion by either side of its opposite affirmation on the point at issue—the identity of Nature between the Divine Father and the Divine Son. The more obstinately, therefore, the argument raged, the more closely it adhered to the debated point. No new issue consequently emerged in the course of the struggle. But when the orthodox doctrine had finally prevailed, and its inferential consequences had begun to be drawn out by one Father after another, then new pairs of logical alternatives presented themselves, and new oppositions were rapidly developed.

Upon the acknowledgment, that is to say, of Jesus the Christ as God the Son, and at the same time as truly Man, a new set of questions appeared. The preliminary inquiry, Can the Divine and the human be united? had been answered. The orthodox doctrine of the Divine-Human Personality of Jesus often having been affirmed unmistakably and with philosophical accuracy by the Council at Nicæa, had at the end of the most desperate struggle which the Church had ever known, triumphed definitely over the opposing view. But Arianism died hard; and to narrate the determined efforts which it made, up to the very end, to obtain the supremacy once more, would be too long for us here, although it can never be otherwise than an interesting subject to the theological student. He must study it, however, in the great work of Dr. Hefele, or the older one of Du Pin; for Dr. Schaff omits that chapter of Church history altogether, and makes a jump from the fourth General Council at Chalcedon to the sixth (A.D. 680), passing over the fifth with a mere mention in a note, and from thence passes to the Council of Trent.

But to return to our review of the course of thought. The Deity of Christ having been recognised, it was immediately debated in what manner the Humanity was compatible with it, and what was the *modus vivendi* between the two natures. Humanly speaking, this translation of the primitive and admitted fact into the accurate language of theology was a dangerous process to thinkers. Not a few who were presumably actuated by the best intentions at first, deflected from Catholic orthodoxy on one side or on the other during the course of their speculations. Apollinaris, in his denial of the Human Soul of Christ, is an example of this danger. Peter Lombard, by denying that God became in the Incarnation what

He was not before, implicitly denied the reality of Christ's Human Nature. '*Deus non factus est aliquid.*' But this position was condemned as *Nihilianism*. Nestorius, in separating the Hypostases, and his opponent Eutyches in confounding them,—a tendency due to the natural reaction from the rationalism of Nestorius; Sergius, in his modified monothelism, which the sixth Œcumenical Council met with its assertion of two natural wills in Jesus Christ, and two natural operations,¹ *indivisibly, inconvertibly, inseparably, inconfusedly* [working] *δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας, ἀδιαρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμειλώς, ἀσυγχύτως*, all of them fall under the same category. The Adoptionist partial revival of the Nestorian mode of thought and reasoning falls beyond our limits, and, indeed, its only novelty consisted in the form which it finally assumed. So that with this Council the second great cycle of thought, viz. the Christological, may be said to have closed. The general result is very well summed up by Dr. Schaff (vol. i. pp. 33, 34):—

'The Chalcedonian Christology has latterly been subjected to a rigorous criticism (by Schleiermacher, Baur, Dörner, Rothe, and others), and has been charged with a defective psychology, and now with dualism, now with docetism, according as its distinction of two natures or of the personal unity has most struck the eye. But these imputations neutralise each other, like the imputations of tritheism and modalism, which may be made against the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity when either the tri-personality or the consubstantiality is taken alone. This, indeed, is the peculiar excellence of the Creed of Chalcedon, that it exhibits so sure a tact and so wise a circumspection in uniting the colossal antithesis in Christ, and seeks to do justice alike to the distinction of the natures and to the unity of the person. In Christ all contradictions are reconciled.

'The Chalcedon Creed is far from exhausting the great mystery of godliness, "God manifest in the flesh." It leaves much room for a fuller appreciation of the genuine, perfect, and sinless humanity of Christ, of the Pauline doctrine of the Kenosis, or self-renunciation and self-limitation of the Divine Logos in the incarnation and during the human life of our Lord, and for the discussion of other questions connected with His relation to the Father and to the Word, His person and His work. But it indicates the essential elements of Christological truth, and the boundary lines of Christological error. It defines the course for the sound development of this central article of the Christian faith, so as to avoid both the Scylla of Nestorian dualism and the Charybdis of Eutychian monophysitism, and to save the full idea of the one Divine-human personality of our Lord

¹ The terms of the reconciliation effected under the Emperor Heraclius with the Monophysite party declared that our Lord performed the acts pertaining both to God and man by one 'theandric' operation.

and Saviour. Within these limits theological speculation may safely and freely move, and bring us to clearer conceptions; but in this world, where we "know only in part (*ἐκ μέρους*)," and "see through a mirror obscurely (*ὡς ἐν ὀπίκτῳ ἐν αἰνίγματι*)," it will never fully comprehend the great central mystery of the theanthropic life of our Lord.

And the late Dr. Mahan well says in his too brief history of the first three centuries of the Church (*Works*, vol. i. p. 538):—

'With the condemnation of Eutyches and Dioscorus, the doctrine of the Incarnation was more exactly defined; and the four words, *truly, perfectly, indivisibly, without confusion*, became from that time the sum of the testimony of the four great Councils, the safeguard against every wind of error, from whatever quarter it might blow. That Jesus Christ is *true* God, had been witnessed at Nicæa; that He is *perfect* Man had been defined at Constantinople; that He is *indivisibly* One Person, had been settled at Ephesus; finally, the six hundred and thirty at Chalcedon declared that "He is one and the same Christ, the Son, the Lord, the Only-begotten, *in two natures, without confusion, change, division or separation.*"'

Dr. Schaff's section on the Athanasian Creed, though not otherwise than fair (he calls the *Quicumque* 'a valuable supplement to the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds), leans somewhat heavily against the early origin of the symbol. The Athanasian authorship he concludes to have been given up on all hands. But in so determining, he does not give its full weight to the array of defensive evidence stated of late years, and which undoubtedly tends to throw back the composition further and further towards the Athanasian age. With the latest work on the Utrecht Psalter, that of Mr. Birch, he is apparently unacquainted. A similar remark may be made as to the latest and, in many respects, the most valuable and convincing of the works upon the date of the Creed—Mr. F. D. W. Ommamney's *Examination of the Athanasian Creed*. He does not discuss the question of the Autun Canon—a most important piece of evidence, without considering which it is not possible to determine the date of *Quicumque* accurately. And the general impression we receive from this portion of his work is that the writer had formed an opinion adverse to the early origin in the course of study long previous to the present work, and had not re-examined the question with the degree of care which the weight and importance of the new evidence adduced by the defenders has a right to require.

Dr. Schaff gives also (vol. ii. pp. 66 *et seqq.*) a revised translation of the *Quicumque*, of which we cannot say that

we think very highly. The version in our own Prayer-Book is a very good one; no doubt it requires amending in a few places, but those are the very places which Dr. Schaff has left untouched. To take them *seriatim* :—

In verse 1 'it is necessary' is too strong a rendering of '*opus est*.' It should be 'it is needful.' For 'it is necessary' the author would almost certainly have written '*necesse est*.' Forcellini declares expressly (in a dreadfully cacophonous sentence): '*Opus est, minus est, quam necesse est*.' Then the force of '*ante omnia*' has been mistaken. It means 'in the first place,' *i.e.* of time, not of importance. It is the *first step to be taken*. So that it means, 'Whosoever desires to be saved, in the first place it is needful to hold the Catholic Faith.' But Dr. Schaff leaves all this as it is.

V. 2: '*sine dubio peribit*' means 'without doubt he *will* perish,' predictive; and not 'he *shall* perish,' denunciatory. The usage of the language with respect to 'shall' and 'will' has, in fact, changed. Dr. Schaff leaves this untouched.

V. 8: His substitution of 'uncreated' for 'uncreate' is quite unnecessary; of 'unlimited' for 'incomprehensible' (*immensus*, v. 9) very bald; *infinite* would be better.

V. 25 has really an improved rendering: but there is in it the same obscurity of meaning which exists in the original. He renders 'there is nothing before or after: nothing greater or less.'

V. 31. The distinction between *ante sæcula*¹ and *in sæculo*, viz. 'before time' [*the ages*] and 'in time,' is obscured in our version, and not restored by Dr. Schaff.

V. 34. The 'be' is strictly correct; and 'is,' which Dr. Schaff would substitute, is merely a modern vulgarism. The English subjunctive is 'be' not 'is.'

V. 36. 'One altogether,' *unus omnino*, though correct, is not clear; but so Dr. Schaff leaves it. We would suggest 'in every respect.'

We need not, however, go all through the Creed. We have said enough, as we conceive, to make good our point.

The Councils between the first 'in Trullo' and that at Trent—an interval of almost nine hundred years—have, as we have already noticed, no place in Dr. Schaff's work. The third great cycle of controversies, the *anthropological*, are similarly passed over, probably because they were decided by no Œcumenical Council, and have left no traces upon either of

¹ Dr. Schaff writes it *secula*; making a very *gratuitous* blunder, for the Utrecht Psalter reads, correctly enough, *sæcula*.

the three Creeds. Such are passed over in the work before us. But from the time of the Council of Trent onwards, it will be found a useful guide to later and even to contemporary ecclesiastical history, and to embody most of the chief documents of a symbolical character. The remaining part of vol. ii. consists of documents arranged in three categories: the Roman, which comprises the Canons, Doctrinal Decrees, and '*Professio*' of the Council of Trent; the Decree, in 1854, of Pius IX., on the Immaculate Conception; the *ipsissima verba* of the Syllabus; and, finally, the Decrees of the Vatican Council of 1870 (as far as yet published). Then follows a section on Greek and Russian Creeds, containing the Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church (1643), the Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672), and the longer Catechism of Archbishop Philaret. These will no doubt give a very sufficient view of the dogmatic system of the Eastern Church. Yet it might have been well, in a professed collection of dogmatic standards, to have given the 'Catechism' of Archbishop Plato, which is certainly one of the most important formularies of the Russian Church. And, we cannot but notice that these are all documents emanating from the Church of Russia. Whether it be that the editor is not familiar with the Church of Greece itself, or whatever be the reason, we miss the various forms employed in Greece, for doctrinal and catechetical purposes; and also the very curious and important 'Confession (1177) of the Armenians,' which is adhered to by sixty-seven out of the two hundred and sixty Eastern Sees. The Coptic 'Confessio Corpus Sanctum' to be found in the longer Liturgy of S. Basil, is also wanting; and in fact all the Coptic forms are passed over without notice. Looked at from an archæological point of view, this division of the work leaves much of completeness to be desired. The third category includes the 'Fourteen Theses' assented to by the Conference at Bonn in 1874, and the Articles of Agreement on the *Filioque* question, agreed to at the same place in 1875; which are all referred to in a very proper spirit, and with an intimate appreciation of the issues involved.

The third volume of this work, the largest division of it—for the seventeenth century was a verbose age—is occupied with the various symbolic documents of the Protestant Confessions. Although these have lost their original importance as terms of communion in any religious bodies at the present day, they have a certain historical significance which justifies their inclusion in the present collection, notwithstanding their number and excessive 'longsomeness.'

It is impossible to understand the religious history of that age without consulting them, and they are here presented to the reader in a very accurate and convenient form. Between the documents in this volume, and the historical and explanatory matter in Vol. I., the student may gain a very competent knowledge of the controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Dr. Schaff has, in fact, wrought out this branch of his subject with an elaborateness almost affectionate. His work gains thereby; but it would not, in our opinion, be correct to say that these multiplied 'Confessions' are of great value from our special point of view in this article. Considered as pure theology, they present little that is really *new* in the history of thought. They are not, that is to say, a true evolution, but a retrocession. They are made up, for the most part, of partial views. Particular points of doctrine are often asserted and defended in them with great judgment and skill. But the better half of dogmatic Christianity the authors had excised from their schemes; and the remainder had not sufficient vitality to keep itself alive. Thus the future development of Protestant theology was, for the most part, towards rationalism. A remarkable exception to this tendency is the Tübingen-Giessen dispute concerning the Kenosis or Humiliation of Christ, which directed attention to a point of Christology not formally settled during the great Christological debates of the fourth and fifth centuries. It may indeed be held, and rightly held, to have been virtually ruled in that earlier age; because the analogy of the Faith, and consistency with doctrinal decisions already arrived at, compelled it to be ruled in one way, and forced the minds of theologians who respected the Catholic traditions, irresistibly to one only decision. This is indeed an example of that process of evolution of doctrine by a logical necessity to which we referred in an earlier part of this article.

The controversy, after continuing for some years, issued in the *Formula of Concord* of 1577. Opinions are, it is true, much divided as to the merits of this production. On the one hand, Krauth asserts that the doctrine of the Person of Christ presented in it 'rests upon the sublimest series of inductions in the history of Christian doctrine. In all confessional history there is nothing to be compared with it in the combination of exact exegesis, of dogmatic skill, and of fidelity to historical development. Fifteen centuries of Christian thought culminate in it.' But on the other hand, Le Blanc somewhat unfairly charges the famous Eighth Article of this Formula,

'*De Personâ Christi*,' on account of its assertion of a Presence other than local, with degenerating into a mere logomachy.¹

And Dr. Schaff himself calls it 'neither clear nor consistent; and charges it with being 'only a series of concessions and counter concessions, and a mechanical juxtaposition of discordant sentences from both parties.' But this which he imputes to it as a fault, is in fact the exact method of the ancient symbolical documents, and the only way by which the distinct and (to human apprehension) opposing sides of a dogmatic truth may be preserved without danger of falling into heresy. We have many examples of it. Here, for instance, in the Athanasian Creed:—

'The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God;

'*And yet They are not three Gods, but one God.*'

The formula is in many ways a remarkable document, and with strong Catholic affinities. The phraseology of Art. vi., '*quod Deus sit Homo, et Homo sit Deus*,' is borrowed from S. Augustine, and S. Athanasius has a phrase very similar. In Art. vii. it allows and asserts that the Blessed Virgin is rightly called the Mother of God—and this, in the true Catholic sense, i.e. *secundum humanitatem*—according to the teaching of S. Cyril. The Hypostatic Union is set forth even eloquently in Art. viii. All these facts are perhaps sufficient to account for Dr. Schaff's disparagement of the document.

Whether, therefore, the development of doctrine be in this particular real or only apparent, we have in it certainly a serious attempt made to carry a step farther the chain of strictly logical doctrinal deduction, in agreement and harmony with the analogy and proportion of the Faith. But with this exception, and perhaps of the tentative but most important endeavours at Bonn in 1874–5 later developments have been partial and sectarian—too often actuated by individual fussiness and idiosyncrasy—and what we must call illegitimate. And it is observable that even the ablest champion of post-Tridentine novelties does not generally venture to derive them by

¹ 'Quâ in controversiâ forte plus est logomachiae atque pertinaciae, quam realis discriminis, nam aliquo sensu concedere possumus, realem communicationem proprietatum naturae divinae naturae Christi humanae factam esse, quatenus, ut dictum est, in naturâ illâ humanâ realiter et personaliter inhabitat, et est divinitas cum omnibus suis proprietatibus, quemadmodum realiter ignis est in ferro ignito, sed quemadmodum ex illâ ignis cum ferro unione recte quidem dicere possumus, ferrum hoc urit, ferrum hoc candet, non tamen recte dicitur, ferreitas urit, ferreitas lucet, quia ignis in ferro, non ipsa tamen ferri natura, ita agit.'—*Theses Theolog. de Unione Duar. in Christo Natur.*

direct process from the principles held by the Primitive Church. Perhaps he felt that it was beyond even his power to do so. It is mostly by attempting an indirect *reductio ad absurdum* of all alternative conclusions, backed up by an often repeated appeal to the authority of the Church, a *Deus ex machinâ*, which never fails any controversialist in a fix, that he tries to leave his reader shut up to the conclusion he desires. It *is* because it *is*, he seems to say; and any other *is*, you see, is quite as hard to believe; and if you throw in the infallible opinion of the Church, this particular *is* must be far easier than any other. Such an attempt cannot be too vigorously resisted. The authority of the Church can do much; but it cannot effectually bolster up an invalid syllogism, nor supply the gaps in a demonstration.

That the formal expressions of Christian theology have been gradually evolved is matter of undoubted fact, plain upon the face of history, and altogether unquestionable. Theology has undergone a development; but a development *from germinal ideas in necessary and logical order*. Because it is necessary and because it is logical, it needs no infallible Pontiff to guide its decisions, much less to originate them, with his *sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*. If this evolution is slow, it is also unerring; because it is subject to the Divine and Providential guidance which was promised to it at the first. A generation may snatch a premature decision, in accordance with the passions of the hour; a Pope may mistake his self-pleasing fancies for eternal truths, and abuse his high position in order to force them upon the peoples he rules; a great temporal sovereign may throw his sword into the ecclesiastical scale, and sway the decisions of synods and assemblies by his irresistible power. But the generation and its tyrant pass away together; the next restores the balance, and reversing, or more probably disregarding utterly, the inequitable decisions, asserts the forgotten truth, and carries a little farther, or at least hands on to its successor intact, the majestic system of Christian theology.

Thus the great outlines of God's truth grow continually clearer. The constant brooding upon it of generation after generation of devout thinkers develops by degrees the remoter consequences of familiar truths, and rounds doctrines inch by inch into a perfect whole. Yet they are not altered, because they are more completely appreciated. It is the same truth, 'yesterday, to-day, and for ever,' which is the heritage of the Church in the nineteenth century as it was in the first. But the later ages hold it more perfectly and

explicitly, as the earlier embraced it with greater faith and fervour, although implicitly and in the germ. There are many difficulties to faith in these later days. We have fallen upon the times which were presaged from the beginning, when 'because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.' But it may be that in the watchful providence of God, since the burden of decision has shifted so significantly from the heart to the intellect, the complete intellectual appreciation of revealed truth is given in place of the childlike and fervid faith which was the heritage of the first ages of Christianity. And if so, we can see how timely is the gift.

ART. VI.—THE EARLY CELTIC CHURCH.

Celtic Scotland: a History of Ancient Alban. By WILLIAM F. SKENE, Author of *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*. Vol. II. *Church and Culture.* (Douglas: Edinburgh.)

THE extreme difficulty of extracting pure historic truth from the annals of the past is now well understood, and there are many of whom we have been wont to speak as our distinguished historians who might with more accuracy have been termed our eminent romancers; but it has been hardly so fully recognised that the theological prepossessions of the chroniclers have made this difficulty exceptionally great in respect to the history of the Church. This has been eminently the case with the early Church of the British Isles, whose history has become a sort of store-house, whence writers of every denomination have sought to draw evidence in support of their conflicting tenets, and their efforts have naturally been greatly facilitated by the mingling of legend and fable with a modicum of truth which characterises the ecclesiastical records of those distant days. The author of *Celtic Scotland*, well known as a learned and conscientious historian, has set himself to gauge the extent of the perversion of history which has thus arisen, and his object in the well executed volume before us has been to free the history of the early Celtic Church from the many fallacies which have distorted it, and to present her as she really was, independent of all theological bias or prejudice. Mr. Skene has brought to his work a

perfect acquaintance with the old Irish, Welsh, and Gaelic dialects, as well as with the French and Latin of those days, which has opened to him the writings of the earliest chroniclers, together with all that could be learned from the connection between ancient and modern nomenclature ; while his accurate topographical knowledge has compelled rocks and stones to speak to him, and the existing features of many a landscape to reveal to him hitherto undiscovered traces of the past.

The volume we are considering, though a substantive work in itself, is the second of three books into which Mr. Skene has divided a general history of Celtic Scotland—the subject of the first, already published, having been *History and Ethnology*, and that of the third, hereafter to appear, *Land and People*. That now before us, on *Church and Culture*, is independent of the other volumes, but the information contained in them naturally casts light on many points of ecclesiastical history which must have remained obscure to historians with a less complete grasp of the subject as a whole. The most striking characteristic of the book is its absolute impartiality. There is not a trace of any partizan religious bias in the whole book. It simply gives in clear, unexaggerated language every detail which has approved itself as authentic, and then leaves the true fabric of the ancient Celtic Church to shape itself out, as it were, from the rugged mass of facts thus brought together, without any manipulation of the author's.

The picture thus presented to us of the earliest stronghold of Christianity in Northern Britain is not only singularly striking, but, bearing on every line the stamp of truth, it is also suggestive of possible solutions to many of the ecclesiastical problems of the present day. We shall endeavour to place before our readers a slight sketch of the general aspect of the primitive Church which seems to grow under our eyes in the pages of this book, though our limited space prevents our giving an adequate idea of the picturesque details with which the volume abounds, or the weird beauty of many of its scenes.

The first ray of light that pierces the gloom of the far-off ages comes to us in the white vision of the Candida Casa, a church of stone, built, with an adjoining monastery, by S. Ninian, in the year 397, for a district christianised by him, which extended along the north shore of the Solway Firth. Well did the name given to that church by the rude natives themselves—Candida Casa—and that by which S. Ninian designated the town on the west of Wigtown Bay, where he placed it—Leukopibia—express the contrast of the pure

Christian light it represented with the darkness of the surrounding paganism. 'It is difficult for us now to realise to ourselves,' says Mr. Skene, 'what pagan life really was—its hopeless corruption, its utter disregard of the sanctity of domestic life, its injustice and selfishness, its violent and bloody character;' and there is no doubt that, prior to the introduction of Christianity, this passage describes the condition both of Scotland and Ireland.

In clearing the ground for the history of the Celtic Church by a brief summary of the forms of worship it was destined to supersede, the author entirely demolishes the popular theory of a so-called Druidical religion.

'The paganism,' he says, 'which characterised the Irish tribes and the nation of the Northern Picts exhibits precisely the same features; and all the really ancient notices we possess of it are in entire harmony with each other in describing it as a sort of fetichism, which peopled all the objects of nature with malignant beings, to whose agency its phenomena were attributed, while a class of persons termed *Magi*, or *Druadh*, exercised great influence among the people from a belief that they were able, through their aid, to practise a species of magic or witchcraft, which might either be used to benefit those who sought their assistance or to injure those to whom they were opposed. How unlike this is in every respect to the popular conception of what is called the Druidical religion will be at once apparent. The process by which this monstrous system has been evoked was simply to invest these same *Druadh* with all the attributes which Cæsar and the classical writers give to the Druids of Gaul, and to transfer to these northern regions all that they tell of Druidism in Gaul; to connect that with the stone monuments—those silent records of a remote age, and possibly of a different race, which have outlived all record of their time—and to assume that the stone circles and cromlechs, which are undoubtedly sepulchral monuments, represent temples and altars. Add to this some false etymologies of terms which are supposed to contain the name of Bel or Baal, and we have at once the popular conception of the Druidical religion, with its hierarchy of Archdruids, Druids, Vates, and Eubates, and all its paraphernalia of temples, altars, human sacrifices, and the worship of Baal.'

The personified powers of 'nature' thus worshipped by the great nation of the Northern Picts were looked upon by the Christian Church as demons. An ancient tract contained in the *Leabhar na h-uidhri* states that 'the demoniac power was great, and so great was it that they—that is, the demons—used to tempt the people in human bodies, and that they used to show them secret places, and places where they should be immortal, and it was in that way they were believed, and it is

these phantoms that the unlearned people call *Sidhe* and *aes Sidhe*. It was to rescue the Picts and their land from this, or more real, thralldom to the powers of evil that Ninian came to their shores as a missionary in the fourth century. He was a bishop of the nation of the Britons. A Christian Church would seem to have been founded in Britain as early as the second century, but it was essentially a part of the Church of the Empire, and was limited to the Latin province. All who dwelt beyond that boundary were termed by the Roman writers 'barbarians,' and their paganism was undisturbed for nearly two centuries longer. Ninian had been trained at Rome in the doctrine and discipline of the Western Church, and Bede states that he was there initiated into all the mysteries of the faith; but a still stronger religious influence seems to have been exerted over him by S. Martin of Tours, whom he visited in that city on his way home to Britain after completing his studies in Rome. It is said that Ninian obtained from S. Martin a band of masons who were to accompany him to the land of the barbarians, that he might build amongst them the church afterwards known as *Candida Casa*; but, whether or not he thus secured assistance for its material framework, it is certainly due to S. Martin's teaching and example that it became the germ of that which in the future was to be a great school of monasticism.

The monastic spirit first spread from its birthplace in the East to Italy, and subsequently to Gaul, through the influence of the great Athanasius, whose *Life of S. Anthony* was written in Rome, when he took refuge there from the persecutions of the Arians in 341. Mr. Skene makes a slight mistake in saying that a few years *later* he was exiled to Treves, his sojourn in that city having been previous to his residence in Rome; but in both places the fervour with which he described the self-denying lives of the Eastern monks worked with so strong an effect among the people that the term 'religious' was already, at that period, given to all who followed a monastic rule, while the word 'secular' was applied to the clergy who did not go beyond the general ecclesiastical rule.

It was, however, by S. Martin of Tours that monasticism was finally established. He founded the first monastery in Gaul—the ancient house of Ligugé, at Poitiers—in 361, whilst only a simple monk, and afterwards, when he became Bishop of Tours, in 372, he raised near that city the great institution which was soon known far and wide as the 'Magus Monasterium.' S. Ninian became thoroughly imbued with this ascetic spirit under the teaching of the saintly Bishop of

Tours, and Candida Casa—the little white church which he built on the stormy north shore of the Solway Firth—was in after years surrounded by the buildings of a 'Magnum Monasterium'—the nucleus in Scotland of that vast monastic system which was destined to be ultimately the chief source of life and strength in the Celtic Church, and its most powerful agency in the conversion of the heathen. Already in the lifetime of S. Ninian the light which shone from Candida Casa extended as far as the mountain range of the Grampians, and won the whole nation of the Southern Picts to abandon, at least for a time, their pagan worship for the religion of Christ. According to the most ancient authorities, S. Ninian himself carried the lamp of the Faith over the sea to the tribes who peopled the hills and valleys of wild green Erin, where he is said to have spent the last years of his life, and to have founded a church in Leinster called Cluanconaire.

The tradition which thus assigns to S. Ninian the first planting of the Church in Ireland is held by Mr. Skene to be much more trustworthy than the accounts which attribute the conversion of that island to S. Patrick, whose somewhat mythical history he thoroughly investigates, coming apparently to the conclusion that certain chroniclers have performed on behalf of this popular saint, the feat an able writer once pronounced the 'most impossible of historical tasks—the creation of evidence which does not exist.' In any case we see the Celtic Church, as it branched forth from Candida Casa, firmly established both in Scotland and Ireland in the end of the fourth century; and as thus for the first time clearly seen in the early dawn of its history, it undoubtedly manifests a high type of spiritual life, although the monastic element was not at first sufficiently developed to work the marvels of missionary enterprise which distinguished its maturity.

After the death of Ninian, which must have taken place in the early part of the fifth century—although Mr. Skene rejects as spurious the authorities by which modern writers have claimed to fix the date on September 16, 432—a long period of historical darkness ensued, furnishing but scanty authentic material for a true picture of the Celtic Church. This silence of contemporary writers for at least a century and a half is due to the fact that when the Roman dominion in Britain came to an end, in 410, the troops were withdrawn from the province, which then ceased to form part of the Empire, and all intercourse with the Continent was completely cut off by the incursions of barbarian tribes into Roman Gaul. Until now the Celtic Church had been an integral part of that

of the Empire, in close connection with the Gallican Church, and she regarded the Patriarch of Rome as the source in the West of ecclesiastical authority and mission; but it seems plain from her subsequent history that during this period of isolation, from the commencement of the fifth century to the close of the sixth, submission to the Papal power formed no part of her constitution, and was not in any sense considered essential to her existence as a Church. From the slight contemporary notices of this period we learn little beyond the introduction of the Pelagian heresy into Britain by Agricola, son of the Pelagian bishop Severianus. This occurred only nineteen years after the termination of the Roman dominion, when there was still sufficient connection with the Gallican bishops for the fact to become known to them. Accordingly they sent first Germanus, and two years later Palladius, as first bishop to the Scots in Ireland, to bring them back to the Catholic faith from the heresy with which they, in common with their brethren on the mainland, were tainted. There is no further mention of the Pelagians, although the mission of Palladius seems to have failed, in so far at least that his episcopate clearly never became an established power in the land, and it is even said to have terminated in his martyrdom, or flight, within a year of its commencement. From this point our only sources of information respecting the isolated Celtic Church are, first, two documents belonging to the eighth century, entitled *A Catalogue of the Saints in Ireland* and the *Litany of Angus the Culdee*; and secondly, the *Confession of S. Patrick*, with his *Epistle to Coroticus*, both of which Mr. Skene accepts as undoubtedly genuine.

We must not pause to describe the maze of conflicting traditions through which the author has to struggle before he arrives at this happy conclusion—sometimes finding Patricius and Palladius represented as the same person, or two Patricks contending equally for an authentic existence, or again a Patrick who seems really to have no substantial being at all, but to be a mere myth surrounded by a mass of legendary fiction. Mr. Skene, however, unwinds the tangled skein, and presents us with a most curious picture of the constitution of the Church at that time. A brief summary of the true history of S. Patrick may be gathered from his own authentic writings, and is of use in leading us to a clear understanding of this part of our subject. Patricius belonged to a Christian people, and was born of a Christian father—Calpornius, a deacon, who lived in the village of Bannavem of Tabernia, where he had a small farm. He was of gentle birth, his father being

also a 'decurio'—i.e. a magistrate—in a Roman provincial town. Patricius lived at this little farm for sixteen years, and at that early age was taken captive and brought to Ireland with many others. He remained there six years in slavery, when he was engaged in tending sheep. Then he escaped in a ship, the sailors of which were pagans, and after three days reached land. He was a second time taken captive by the same people, and remained with them two months, when he was again delivered from their hands. A few years later he was with his parents in Britain, when he resolved, in consequence of a vision, to leave his native land and his kindred, that he might go to Ireland as a missionary and preach the Gospel. He must at that time have been about thirty years old, and having been early made a deacon, he went to Ireland in priest's orders. At the age of forty-five he was consecrated a bishop, and in his *Epistle to Coroticus* he designates himself as 'Patricius, a sinner and unlearned, but appointed a bishop in Ireland.' It is clear that he laboured as a missionary for fifteen years at least before he was raised to the episcopate, and it was only in the latter part of his life that his labours were crowned with much success. In his Confession he tells us that, through his ministry, clerics had been ordained for the Hibernian people newly come to the faith, and that 'those who never had the knowledge of God, and had hitherto only worshipped unclean idols, had become the people of the Lord, and were called the sons of God;' and in his Epistle he addresses 'the beloved brethren and children whom he had begotten in such numbers to Christ.'

This simple account, given by S. Patrick of himself, became encrusted at a later period with a mass of legendary and fictitious matter, which was amplified by successive biographers till his labours and their results assumed a very unreal aspect. We find, however, from the *Catalogue of the Saints*—an undoubtedly genuine document, which arranges these holy persons in three classes, corresponding to three different periods—that during the century and a half in the history of the Church with which we are at present dealing, her organisation underwent marked changes three several times under external influences. In the first period we have churches and a secular clergy; in the second these give place to monasteries and a monastic clergy; while in the third stage we have an eremitical clergy, living in solitary places. During the first period the Church was entirely moulded by S. Patrick, and we find that upwards of one-half of the clerics whom he ordained were bishops, and that

he placed a bishop consecrated by himself in each church which he founded. The *Catalogue of the Saints*, speaking of the clergy at this time, says that they had 'one Head—Christ—and one chief—Patricius—and that they were all bishops, famous and holy and full of the Holy Ghost, three hundred and fifty in number;' and this is confirmed by Angus the Culdee in his Litany, where he invokes seven times fifty bishops with three hundred priests, whom Patrick ordained, and quotes the verse—

'Seven times fifty holy bishops
The Saint ordained,
With three hundred pure presbyters,
'Upon whom he conferred orders'—

thus fully recognising the distinction between a bishop and a presbyter, though the relative proportion of bishops and presbyters was very different from what it afterwards became.

S. Patrick's system seems to have resembled that which existed in the East in the first centuries of the Church, where, besides the chief bishop in each city, whose consecration was not valid without the action of three bishops, there was an order of chorepiscopi, or country bishops, who were consecrated by the chief bishop alone. S. Patrick's consecration had evidently been to the higher order, so that he considered himself the spiritual head over the whole people; and he states in his *Epistle to Coroticus* that, as he was constituted *the* Bishop in Ireland, he founded churches wherever he could obtain a grant of land from the chief of a tribe, and placed in each a bishop ordained by himself alone, with one or more presbyters under him. It was, in short, a congregational and tribal episcopacy, united by a federal rather than a territorial tie, under regular jurisdiction.

Later on S. Patrick seems to have formed a very peculiar sort of Collegiate Church, consisting of seven bishops placed together in one spot, who were usually seven brothers selected from a family in the tribe. This singular episcopal system was extended into Scotland at the end of the fifth century, in consequence of a settlement of Irish people in the Argyle-shire coasts and in some of the western islands, who had been converted or confirmed in the Christian faith by S. Patrick. They were Scots from a district named Dalriada (the north-eastern part of Ulster), and apparently established this same Collegiate Church wherever they went. They certainly did so in the island of Iona, as the 'seven bishops of Hii'—the ancient name of that spot—are twice mentioned by

Angus the Culdee. The Church thus constituted was plainly secular, as it is stated that the clergy of this period 'rejected not the services and society of women,—they excluded from the Church neither laymen nor women, because, founded on the Rock Christ, they feared not the blast of temptation.' They were tonsured, but it was not the tonsure representing the crown of thorns, now worn by monks; their heads were shaved from ear to ear, and left bare at the front, while at the back the hair flowed down to its full length. Evidently the celibacy of the clergy was not enforced in this first period of the Celtic Church, since we find it distinctly named as a characteristic of the saintly clerics of the *second* period that 'they refused the services of women, separating them from the monasteries.' We find occasional instances of dedication to a single life, as in the case of S. Bridget, who is stated to have been 'consecrated a virgin by S. Patrick,' and to have formed a society consisting of eight virgins and one widow. She is said also to have sent one of these virgins to Candida Casa, in Scotland, to be trained in religion, but it seems certain that these were only accidental features of a thoroughly secular Church, in which the monks were laymen, while the clergy consisted of bishops with their presbyters and deacons. The churches of those days were of wood or wattles, as were also the rude huts of the clergy; and the somewhat curious explanation is given of the word *Duirtheach*, employed to denote the early wooden church, that it meant 'the house in which tears are shed.' Such, therefore, so far as we are able to discern it through the mist of ages, was the Celtic Church of the first period; and there is ample evidence that, constituted as it then was, 'it proved ineffectual to win the people over to any great extent to a thorough adoption of Christianity.' Planted by S. Ninian in Scotland and by S. Patrick in Ireland, it failed in both countries to effect a permanent conversion of the native tribes, and S. Patrick was doomed to witness, even in his own lifetime, a great declension from the Christian Church and a relapse into paganism. The remedy was, however, at hand, and it introduces us to the second period, which is separated from the first in all essential points by a distinct line of divergence. The effete and decaying Celtic Church, which after the death of S. Patrick we see languishing among a people relapsing into barbarism, was restored to vigorous life by the introduction of the true monastic element, with its principles of self-devotion and purity, and its powerful, firmly-knit organisation. This great work seems to have received some assistance from Candida

Casa, now rising into prominence as a school of monastic life, but it was mainly effected in Ireland by Finnian and twelve of his principal disciples, who filled the land with monasteries and became known as the Twelve Apostles of Ireland.

Finnian had received his training in Wales, to which monachism had spread from Gaul through Bretagne in the beginning of the fifth century. He sprang from a race of Picts in Ireland, and after having been there instructed in the faith by two Christian teachers, named Fortchern and Caiman, he crossed the Irish Channel in his thirtieth year to the city of Kilmaine, where he placed himself under the direction of three eminent fathers of the Welsh Monastic Church—S. Cadoc, S. David, and Gildas the historian. He remained thirty years in Britain, chiefly in the Monastery of S. Davids, and then returned to Ireland, followed, as the old chronicler expresses it, 'by several of the religious Britons, to gather together a people acceptable to the Lord.' He there founded the great Monastery of Clonard, in Meath, which ultimately contained no fewer than three thousand monks, and became a vast seminary of religious life, whence many eminent saints went forth to evangelise the country. When this first important step in his mission had been accomplished, Finnian was seized with a strong desire to go on a pilgrimage to Rome; but while he was preparing for his departure we are told that 'an angel of God came to him, and said unto him, "What would be given to thee at Rome shall be given to thee here. Arise and renew sound faith and doctrine in Ireland after Patrick."' Finnian, like S. Paul, whom he is said in his habits and life to have resembled, was not disobedient to the heavenly vision, but remained in his native land, labouring there until his death. He is described in an old martyrology as 'a doctor of wisdom and a tutor of saints in his time.'

The work accomplished by Finnian and the Twelve Apostles of Ireland (whose several names are preserved in an ancient *Life of the Saint*) and their successors, was wonderful in its rapidity and completeness. It established the Christian religion on a permanent basis throughout the land, while the languishing Church was inspired with a new and living energy by its entire reorganisation on the monastic system, which drew the whole body of clergy into submission to the higher rule.

'It seems difficult,' says Mr. Skene, 'now to understand how there should have proceeded so great an influence from a small body of monastic clergy, living in these isolated spots, as so rapidly to overthrow the heathenism of a great people, and to bring them so generally and speedily into subjection to the Christian Church. The

monastic character of the Church gave, however, a peculiar stamp to her missionary work, which caused her to set about it in a mode well calculated to impress a people still to a great extent under the influence of heathenism. . . . The monastic missionaries did not commence their work, as the earlier secular Church would have done, by arguing against their idolatry, superstition, and immorality, and preaching a purer faith ; but they opposed to it the antagonistic characteristics and purer life of Christianity. . . . They settled down as a little Christian colony, living under a monastic rule, requiring the abandonment of all that was attractive in life. They exhibited a life of purity, holiness, and self-denial. They exercised charity and benevolence, and they forced the respect of the surrounding pagans to a life the motives of which they could not comprehend, unless they resulted from principles higher than those their pagan religion afforded them ; and having won their respect for their lives, and their gratitude for their benevolence, these monastic missionaries went among them with the Word of God in their hands, and preached to them the doctrines and the pure morality of the Word of Life. No wonder if kings and nations became converted to Christianity, and incorporated the Church into their tribal institutions in a manner which now excites our wonder, if not our suspicion. . . . But these monastic establishments probably acquired a still greater influence from the extent to which they had obtained possession of the instruction of the young. They soon became, in fact, great educational seminaries, to which the youth of the tribe were sent, not only to be trained to monastic life, but also for the purpose of receiving secular education. . . . Even in the smaller monasteries the number of scholars was usually fifty. In the larger of course a much greater number were taught. Hence a single generation was sufficient to convert the mass of the people to be devoted adherents of the Church.'

We can only briefly touch on the chief features of the Celtic Church in this her second period. The mode of her administration was peculiar. She did not possess what may be called a diocesan episcopacy—the union, that is, of the power of mission, which is the source of jurisdiction, with the power of conferring holy orders which belongs to the episcopate. The monasteries, which embraced within their fold the entire clergy, claimed exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, and in order to secure that exercise of episcopal functions which was essential to the existence of a clergy, they had resident bishops in their own houses, who were subject to the abbot, as being under monastic rule. The Celtic Church being entirely monastic at that time, the whole of her episcopate was necessarily in this position. The superior grade of the bishop was in no sense lowered by it to the level of the presbyter ; but the power of mission was vested in the monastery, and not in him, and the

jurisdiction of which it was the source was exercised by the abbot as its head. Occasionally the abbot himself was in episcopal orders, when of course this anomaly did not exist, but generally he remained in priestly orders only, so that the bishop simply appears as a separate member of the community, and the 'presbyter abbot' is the more important functionary. The whole land seems to have been soon filled with these religious houses, whose rapid growth is accounted for by the extreme simplicity of their construction. They consisted merely of clusters of wooden huts, formed of the rudest materials. The larger monasteries were, in fact, Christian colonies, into which converts, after being tonsured, were brought as monks. The brutish degradation of the paganism from which they emerged rendered it impossible for them to lead a Christian life at all, excepting under the monastic system. It secured to them safety and protection in a peaceful home, which they could probably nowhere else have found. The fact that all monasteries possessed the privilege of the sanctuary, which the superstitious fears of the people prevented them from ever violating, was no doubt a sufficient reason to induce many wild spirits to seek a shelter there, who might not otherwise have cared to submit themselves to an ascetic rule. Even the smallest monasteries appear to have contained at least 150 monks, and the aggregate of brethren in each house was termed its *muintir* or *familia*. The elders gave themselves entirely to devotion and the service of the Church, occupying their leisure chiefly in transcribing the Scriptures in their cells. There were also working brethren, employed in agricultural and mechanical labours, while others were engaged in training the young, who were said to be 'learning wisdom.' A singular characteristic of the religious system of this period was the claim of the Church upon the first-born male of every human couple, as well as on the firstlings and firstfruits of animals and plants. In an ancient statement of the law which regulated these offerings, it is stated that the son who is thus given to serve God as a monk, must be the child of a mother who had been made the first lawful wife by 'confession according to the soul friend,' which last significant term was that given in those days to the confessor. It was also enacted that if a slave entered a monastery, or received Church orders in any shape, he should thereby become free, and that 'plebeians in like manner should be exalted.' But by far the most marked note of the Church at this period was the extraordinary energy of the missionary zeal with which she was inspired by the great revival of spiritual

life that had taken place within her. The irrepressible desire to carry her teaching and institutions to all who knew her not, was first directed towards the unconverted tribes in Britain and the neighbouring islands ; but it soon led to a perfect stream of Christian missionaries being sent forth from the bosom of the Celtic Church to invade the Continent in all directions. The forerunner of these was Columbanus, of whose holy enterprise the following striking account is given :—

‘In the year 590 the ecclesiastical world in Gaul, in which the Franks and Burgundians were already settled, was startled by the sudden appearance of a small band of missionaries on her shores. They were thirteen in number—a leader with twelve followers. Their outward appearance was strange and striking ; they were clothed in a garment of coarse texture made of wool, and of the natural colour of the material, under which was a white tunic. They were tonsured, but in a different manner from the Gaulish ecclesiastics. Their heads were shaved in front from ear to ear, while their hair flowed down from the back of the head. They had each a pilgrim’s staff, a leathern water-bottle, and a wallet with a case containing some relics. They spoke among themselves a foreign language, resembling in sound the dialect of Armorica ; but they conversed readily in Latin with those who understood that language. When asked who they were and whence they came, they replied, “We are Irish, dwelling at the very ends of the earth. We be men who receive naught beyond the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles. The Catholic Faith, as it was first delivered by the successors of the Holy Apostles, is still maintained among us with unchanged fidelity.” And their leader then gave the following account of himself :—“I am a Scottish pilgrim, and my speech and actions correspond to my name, which is in Hebrew, Jonah ; in Latin, Columba—a dove—and in Greek, Peristera.” In this guise they appeared before the people, addressing them everywhere with the whole power of their native eloquence. Some learned the language of the country ; the rest employed an interpreter when they preached before the laity ; to ecclesiastics they spoke the common language of the Latin Church. Their leader, Columbanus, was a man of commanding presence and powerful eloquence, and endowed with a determination of character and intensity of purpose which influenced, either favourably or the reverse, everyone with whom he came in contact. From the kings he soon obtained permission to erect monasteries and settle in their territories ; and two monasteries soon arose within the deep recesses of the Vosges Mountains—those of Luxeuil and Fontaines—to which the youth of the country flocked in numbers for instruction or for training as monks.’

These monasteries had not been long established when a controversy arose between the Irish missionaries and the Gaulish clergy respecting the time of celebrating Easter, which

affords us some insight into the attitude of the Celtic Church towards Rome. The changes in the computation, according to the tables of Victorius, which had been established in the Western Church by a canon of the fourth Council of Orleans, held in 541, took place during the isolation of the British Churches, so that they still retained the older computation, by which Easter was fixed for the Sunday between the fourteenth and twentieth days of the moon, in the first month of the Jewish lunar year, calculated according to a cycle of eighty-four years; while the Continental Churches celebrated that festival on the Sunday between the fifteenth and the twenty-first days of the moon, calculated on a cycle of nineteen years. The bishops in Gaul accused the missionaries from Ireland of being schismatics on this point, and affirmed that their practices were at variance with the Universal Church; to which they replied by vindicating their right to follow the custom derived from their fathers. Finally Columbanus appealed to the Pope himself—having inherited the traditionary respect for the See of Rome which had naturally resulted from the early position of the Celtic Church in the northern provinces of the Roman Empire; but it is evident that he considered himself in no sense bound to submit to the authority of the Patriarch of Rome. He claims the right to live according to the laws of his own Church, and justifies himself by the second canon of the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople held in the year 381, which directs that the bishops belonging to each diocese shall not interfere with churches beyond its bounds. The position which Columbanus took up was substantially this:—‘Your jurisdiction as Bishop of Rome does not extend beyond the limits of the Roman Empire. I am a missionary from a Church of God among the barbarians, and though temporarily within the limits of your territorial jurisdiction, and bound to regard you with respect and deference, I claim the right to follow the customs of my own Church, handed down to us by our fathers.’

Mr. Skene considers, however, that some historians have been unreasonably afraid of admitting any connection between Rome and the early Celtic Church. ‘The Rome of the fourth and fifth centuries,’ he says, ‘was not the Rome of the Middle Ages; it was the Church of S. Augustine and S. Jerome. There was no question then about supremacy, and the Bishop of Rome was simply regarded with respect as the head of the Christian Church within the Western provinces of the Empire, of which Rome was the capital; questions of ecclesiastical supremacy did not arise till the Empire was broken up.’ Au-

thentic writings by Columbanus are still extant, in one of which he clearly alludes to the Athanasian Creed; and we owe to him much valuable evidence of the state of the Church in his day. This wise missionary was numbered among the Twelve Apostles of Ireland, whose self-devotion and zeal worked such wonders of grace both in their own country and in foreign lands; but their noble band comprised at that time one greater than Columbanus, whose memory still clings with ever-living fragrance round the broken arches and the seagirt ruins of beautiful Iona.

As the picture of the true Celtic Church grows slowly clearer to us in the lessening vista of the receding centuries, the grand figure of S. Columba stands out prominently in the foreground, and with him we now turn to witness a further development of the highest form of monastic life on the rugged shores of Scotland. It is the fate of all marked men who have set their stamp upon their age to become the subjects of spurious traditions, which invest them in the popular mind with attributes to which they have no claim. This has been pre-eminently the case with S. Columba; many mistaken views have been held of his mission, and his latest historian, Montalembert, has given a quite unreal, though certainly most eloquent, description of his character. The present author, however, has resolutely rejected all sources of information respecting him, excepting such as are of undoubted authenticity. All legends contain some features which may be considered historical; and there exist happily two very early biographies of Columba, by which later accounts of his life can be tested. These were written by Cumme and Adamnan, both of whom were his successors in the abbacy of his own monastery very soon after he himself had been taken from it. Cumme ruled at Iona as abbot just sixty years after the death of Columba, and Adamnan twenty-two years later. We can only very briefly analyse the history of the Saint as derived by Mr. Skene from these authorities.

Columba was born on December 7, 521, and was baptised by that name, but he is often spoken of as Columcille or 'Columba of the Church,' from the frequency of his attendance on the services as a child. He was trained in the monastic school of Finnian, at Clonard, whence he emerged, filled with burning missionary zeal, to become not only one of the Twelve Apostles of Ireland, but emphatically *the* Apostle of Scotland. When he was forty-two years of age, his early biographers state that, 'resolving to seek a foreign country for

the love of Christ,' he sailed from Ireland to Britain, accompanied by twelve disciples, his fellow-soldiers.

Columba resolved to follow the principle on which all missionary enterprises were then conducted, by organising an establishment which should exhibit the religious life in its highest self-denial and purity, as well as by preaching the Word of God. For the site of his monastery, he selected the small island separated from Mull by a narrow channel, which now bears the name of Iona, but was at that time known as Ia or Hii, and which seems to have been given to him by the Picts, to whom his mission was directed. There were traces in the place of an earlier religious establishment, founded by the Dalriadic Christians, but which failed to satisfy Columba's standard. We are told in an ancient chronicle that he arrived at Iona on Whitsun-eve, A.D. 563, and that 'two bishops who were in the island came to lead him by the hand out of it, but God now revealed to him that they were not true bishops, whereupon they left the island to him.' They were no doubt the remains of the anomalous Church of Seven Bishops, which there as elsewhere preceded the monastic Church, but they seemed to have submitted at once to Columba's refusal to recognise their episcopal authority, and he obtained complete possession of Iona. The Saint could not have found a spot better adapted to be the centre of a great missionary work, where the Christian life could be manifested in its highest form in contrast with the surrounding paganism.

In Iona, therefore, Columba founded his Church, 'which not only for a time embraced the whole of Scotland, with the Firths of Forth and Clyde, within its fold, and was for a century and a half the national Church of Scotland, but which was destined also to give to the Angles of Northumbria the same form of Christianity for a period of thirty years.' The government in the Columban Church was the same as that already described in Ireland. The bishops were under monastic rule, and although the superiority of their orders over those of the priest were fully recognised, and they were allowed the free exercise of their episcopal functions, they were yet subject to the Presbyter Abbot, whose jurisdiction extended over the whole province. The Monastery of Iona, which became the mother house of many others founded by Columba in the neighbouring islands, and ultimately in more distant provinces, consisted of a hundred and fifty monks. The buildings were constructed of wood and wattle, of which no trace now exists; the present ruins are the remains of stone buildings of a much later period. Adamnan,

however, describes the first erection very fully. He speaks of the 'monasterium,' or monastery proper, containing a refectory of large size, with a fireplace and cistern, and where also there was a flat stone bearing the special name of *Moel-blatha*—i.e. 'flat stone of division'—on which the 'eulogia,' or blessed bread, was divided; the 'hospitium,' or guest chamber, which was wattled; and the cells of the monks, with the 'plateola,' or little court, round which they were built. He describes the church as an oaken building, with an 'exedra,' or side chamber, and mentions also that crosses were erected on various spots; two especially were raised in commemoration of a touching incident. Ernan, Columba's uncle, had been placed by him in charge of a monastery in one of the Garveloch Islands, and feeling himself stricken with a fatal illness, he desired to see Columba once again, and crossed over to Iona for that purpose. He walked from the landing-place to meet the Saint, who came to greet him; but when there were only twenty-four paces between them he fell down and died before Columba could see his face, and the interval of distance which separated them was thereupon marked by the erection of two stone crosses.

The Saint himself, as abbot, occupied a cell on a rising ground overlooking the monastery, where he spent much of his time in devotion, and also in reading and writing, having one attendant and occasionally two of the brethren awaiting his orders at the door. He slept on the bare ground, with a stone for his pillow, which was afterwards placed as a monument over his grave. The members of the community took solemn monastic vows on bended knees in the church, and were addressed by Columba as his 'familia,' or chosen monks. Their dress consisted of a white 'tunica' as an under garment, over which they wore a 'camilia' or cloak and hood made of wool left in the native colour of the material. Their feet were shod with sandals when out of doors; their food was barley bread with milk, and occasionally eggs and fish.

'With regard to Divine worship,' says Mr. Skene, 'Adamnan does not specially mention a daily service; but the recitation of the Psalter is so repeatedly alluded to as an important part of the service that a part of the day was probably given to it . . . but the principal service was unquestionably the celebration of the Eucharist, which took place on the *Dies Dominica* . . . and on the stated festivals of the Church, as well as on such particular occasions as the Abbot may have appointed. It is termed by Adamnan "the Sacred Mysteries of the Eucharist" and "the Mysteries of the Sacred Oblation." The priest, standing before the altar, consecrated the elements. When

several priests were present, one was selected who might invite a brother presbyter to break bread with him in token of equality. When a bishop was present, he broke the bread alone, in token of his superior office. The brethren then approached and partook of the Eucharist. The chief festival of the year was the Paschal Solemnity. The practice of making the sign of the Cross is repeatedly mentioned by Adamnan. One very important feature of this monastic system was the penitential discipline to which the monks were subjected. The ordinary discipline consisted of fasting on Wednesday and Friday during Lent, to which those who practised extreme asceticism added the strange custom of passing a certain time with the body entirely immersed in water, and in that uncomfortable condition reciting the whole or part of the Psalter; but when anyone, whether lay or cleric, desired to enter upon a special course of exercises, it was usual to select a distinguished saint as his *anmchara*, or soul friend, under whose direction it was fulfilled. After the commission of any offence the penitent was required to confess his sins before the community, generally on his knees, and to perform such penance as the Abbot prescribed, when he was either absolved or enjoined a more lengthened discipline. Adamnan records two instances of this severer discipline. In one, where the sin was very great, Columba imposed as a penance "perpetual exile in tears and lamentations among the Britons," and in another the penitent, who had assumed the clerical habit, was sentenced to do penance for seven years in the island of Tiree, and accomplished his penance in the monastery in that island. In conclusion, all the members of the community were by their monastic vow bound to yield prompt and implicit obedience to the Abbot of the mother Church, who was termed Holy Father and Holy Senior.'

In thus describing the constitution of the central Monastery of Iona, and the many others dependent upon it, we are detailing the system which pervaded the whole Columban Church, and alone shewed forth the Christian religion at that time to the surrounding unconverted nations. While the practice of the monks was a rule of self-denial, asceticism, and obedience, their doctrines were those common to the Western Church prior to the fifth century. They did not recognise the authority of Rome in matters of dispute; for, in the words of Columbanus, 'they received nought but the doctrines of the Evangelists and Apostles;' and Adamnan declares that the foundation of Columba's preaching, and his great instrument of conversion, was the Word of God. The Church thus built up on the groundwork of sound faith and holy practice soon spread far beyond the regions of its first foundation.

Two years after Columba's first appearance in Iona, he crossed the great mountain barrier of Drumalban, and made his way to the palace, situated near the river Ness, of King

Brude, the great monarch of the Pictish nation, and one direct object of his mission. If we may not quite accept Adamnan's statement, that the barred and bolted gates of the palace flew open of their own accord when the Saint made the sign of the Cross over them, and that the same holy sign caused the hand of the King to fall, which was raised to slay him, it is certain that his spiritual power proved irresistible, and that Brude was, within a few months of the monks' arrival, baptised by Columba. During a period of nine years after the conversion of this king, the great missionary was chiefly engaged in spreading the truth among the Pictish tribes, who were his subjects; and not long afterwards we find him sending some of his monks to Christianise the distant Orkneys.

S. Columba's life and its powerful influence on the Celtic Church lasted thirty-four years from the day when he first landed at Iona, to that on which he announced with rapture to the brethren, assembled round him as he celebrated the Holy Eucharist, that he had seen an angel looking down upon the altar, who had demanded of him that he should now at last deliver up his soul 'as a deposit dear to God.' Long and wearing as his period of toil must have seemed to him, it was but a short time for winning such extensive conquests for the kingdom of Christ. In these thirty-four years Columba had gathered the whole Pictish nation into the fold of the Church, and founded monasteries in many districts far remote from Iona—amongst others at Lismore and elsewhere in Ireland, whither he returned for a short time during his long pilgrimage in Britain. His influence was as great in his native land as on the Scottish shores; for all the Irish religious establishments looked on the insular Monastery of Iona as the mother Church, and yielded obedience to her jurisdiction. In Scotland Columba was the acknowledged head of the Church, whose fiat decided the election of a king in succession to Brude, and from whom the consecration was received which set the chosen prince upon the throne. The whole history of Columba's great mission is given in detail by Mr. Skene, who gives authorities for every statement made; but for all details we must refer our readers to the work itself. The character of the Saint is also carefully described. His entire devotion of soul and body to the service of the Church, his self-abnegation and ascetic purity of life, no doubt worked as direct manifestations of the grace of God upon the lawless and superstitious people around; but he had personal qualities, to which may be attributed much of the fascination which he exercised. He was eloquent, imaginative, and a poet in the fullest sense

of the word. Mr. Skene quotes one very striking poem, which he does not doubt to have been actually composed by Columba, of which the wild music has a charm not always found in more cultured verses; but that on which all his biographers expatiate was the wonderful strength and beauty of his voice, which was singularly clear and sonorous. In an ancient record it is thus described:—

‘The sound of his voice, Columcille’s,
Great its sweetness above every company,
To the end of fifteen hundred paces—
Vast courses—it was clear.’

Columba lived to the age of seventy-seven years; and before he departed he must have had the happiness of knowing that the Church had yet further extended her borders over the whole of Cumbria through the agency of S. Kentigern, Bishop of Glasgow, whom he travelled to meet in that city, and who had also carried the Gospel light into some of the unconverted districts of Wales.

Adamnan gives a long and interesting history of Columba’s last days, nearly the whole of which is quoted by Mr. Skene; but we have only space for the touching account of his actual death, which is prefaced by one little incident too charming to be passed over. The Saint was returning to the monastery for the last time from a service held, apparently in order to win a blessing for the harvest, in the barn, when he met a white horse which ‘as a willing servant’ had daily carried the milk-vessels from the cowshed to the refectory. The animal came up to him, laid its head on his bosom, uttered plaintive cries, and, like a human being, shed copious tears, greatly wailing. The attendant strove to drive the weeping mourner away; but the Saint forbid him, saying, ‘Lo thou, as thou art a man, and hast a rational soul, canst know nothing of my departure hence, except what I myself have told thee; but to this brute beast, devoid of reason, the Creator Himself hath evidently in some way made known that its master is about to leave it. Let it alone; let it pour out its bitter grief into my bosom.’ That same evening Adamnan describes how S. Columba entered the church in order to celebrate the nocturnal vigils of the Lord’s Day, and when they were over he returned to his cell and spent the first part of the night on his couch, which, even in his feebleness, was still but ‘the bare flag’ with the stone pillow. While reclining there he commended his last words to his brethren thus:—‘Have peace always and unfeigned charity among yourselves. The Lord,

the Comforter of the good, will be your Helper, and I, abiding with Him, will intercede for you, that He may provide for you good things both temporal and eternal.' Having thus spoken he became silent, but when the bell rang at mid night—

'he arose and went to the church, and running more quickly than the rest, he entered alone and knelt down in prayer beside the altar. Diormet, his attendant, following more slowly, saw from a distance the whole interior of the church filled at the same moment with a heavenly light; but when he drew near to the door the same light, which had also been seen by some of the brethren, quickly disappeared. Diormet, however, entering the church, cried out in a mournful voice, "Where art thou, father?" and feeling his way in the darkness—the lights not having yet been brought in by the brethren—he found the Saint lying before the altar; and raising him up a little, and sitting down beside him, he laid his holy head on his bosom. Meantime the rest of the brethren ran in, and beholding their father dying, whom living they so loved, they burst into lamentations. The Saint, however—his soul not having yet departed—opened wide his eyes and looked around him from side to side, as if seeing the holy angels coming to meet him. Diormet then, raising his right hand, urged him to bless the brethren; but the holy father himself moved his hand at the same time as well as he was able, and having thus signified to them his holy benediction; he immediately breathed his last. His face still remained ruddy and brightened in a wonderful way from the heavenly vision: so that he had the appearance not so much of one dead as of one that sleepeth.'

The death of Columba occurred on Sunday morning, June 9, A.D. 597, and in an ancient tract it is stated that the people mourned for him as their 'souls' light.' He left an undying memory in the land he had won to Christ. We learn from Bede, respecting the subsequent Abbots of Iona, that 'Columba left successors distinguished for their great charity, Divine love, and strict attention to their rules of discipline.' In the time of Abbot Fergna, the third in succession from the great Saint, an event occurred which resulted in the extension of the Celtic Church to Northumbria. In the year 617 the sons of Aidilfrid, King of Bernicia, took refuge in Iona from Aeduin, King of Deira, who had slain their father and usurped his throne in the city of York. They were pagans, as were also Aidilfrid and Aeduin, but they at once became catechumens under the monks of Iona, and received the grace of baptism. Oswald, the second son of Aidilfrid, is especially mentioned as remaining at Iona during the remainder of Fergna's tenure of the abbacy, and for ten years more under Abbot Segine, his successor. During the interval

of Oswald's exile in Iona, the usurper Aeduin had married the daughter of the Christian King of Kent, and been himself converted by the preaching of Paulinus, who brought the queen to York, and was appointed bishop of that see by Gustus, Archbishop of Canterbury. The people of Bernicia and Deira ostensibly embraced Christianity; but in the course of a short time Aeduin was slain by the heathen Penda of Mercia and the apostate Caedwalla of Wales, who took possession of the country. The infant Christian Church was trampled under foot, and Paulinus fled back to Kent. After a year had elapsed, during which time the land was given up to paganism, Oswald, who was then aged thirty, and the rightful heir to the Anglian throne by the death of his brother, invaded Northumbria, and won back his kingdom in a battle, which was termed that of the 'Heavenly Field,' near Hexham. His first care was to restore the Christian Church, which had been swept away, and for this purpose he naturally turned to Iona, where he had himself been trained in the faith. The monks at once responded to the call. A missionary priest was first sent to York, who is represented as having been so severe and uncompromising that his mission failed, and he was recalled. Whereupon a great council was held at Iona, under the presidency of the Abbot Segine, and the monk Aidan having been found, by the wise counsel he gave, endowed with the 'grace of a singular discretion,' it was decided that he should be consecrated bishop and sent forthwith into Northumbria. There he speedily planted the Celtic Church, with precisely the same monastic organisation as in Iona. He followed the usual Columban system by selecting a small island on the Northumbrian coast, named Lindisfarne, as the site of a monastery, where he was to rule as abbot bishop, instead of fixing his episcopal see in York.

This Northumbrian Church, established A.D. 635, proved nobly efficient in missionary work; Bede tells us that the Gospel of Truth was preached throughout all the provinces of the Angles over which Oswald reigned. The people were baptised, churches were built, and monasteries founded on land freely given by the King for that purpose. Lindisfarne, since called 'the Holy Island,' continued, however, to be the central religious establishment of the kingdom, whence for sixteen years Bishop Aidan administered the affairs of his diocese. Before his death, the Easter controversy was renewed with great violence through the action of an Irish abbot who had adopted the Roman computation, and sought to induce the Abbot of Iona to follow his example and abandon

the customs 'he had received from his fathers.' The controversy spread over the whole Celtic Church, and its course is fully detailed by Mr. Skene.

A fatal schism grew up on this subject in the Church of Iona, and Adamnan, the biographer of Columba, took no small share in it, as he adopted the Roman use during his tenure of the abbacy, while his monks adhered pertinaciously, against his will, to the ancient Celtic customs. Finally, some eighty years after the mission of Bishop Aidan, matters reached such a crisis that when the Abbot Duncadh of Iona, with some of the monks, gave in their adhesion to the Roman custom, the opposing section elected another abbot. One year later, on the death of Duncadh, Naiton, King of the Picts, who had adopted the Roman use, drove the rival abbot and his monks out of the kingdom. The Columban Church of Northumbria had ceased, thirty years earlier, to have any right to that distinctive name, when the clerics who would not conform to the Roman system had been forcibly ejected from it.

It is, however, only on this one vexed question of the Easter festival that we find any changes in the Celtic Church during the seventh century when these events were taking place, excepting such as indicate progress in letters and general culture; for instance, we have the appearance at this time of a new functionary in all the monasteries, who was termed the 'scriba,' whose duties were to transcribe the ancient records, and to act as teacher and public lecturer. Writings still extant indicate a high standard of cultivation. The following is a prayer written by one of them at the end of the Gospels, of which he had made a fair copy:—

'O God, whose mercy is unbounded and whose holiness passeth speech, with humble voice have I boldness to implore that, like as Thou didst call Matthew to be a chosen Apostle from the receipt of custom, so of Thy compassion Thou wilt vouchsafe me to direct my steps during this life into the perfect way; and place me in the angelic choir of the Heavenly Jerusalem, that on the everlasting throne of endless joy I may be deemed worthy to join the harmonious praises of archangels in ascribing honour to Thee; through Thy only-begotten Son, who liveth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit throughout all ages. Amen.'

The same scribe, in writing out the enumeration of the Apostles by S. Matthew, places in the margin opposite the name of Judas Iscariot the word 'Wretch.'

The Celtic Church at this time most rigidly enforced celibacy on the monastic clergy, and there was no trace then of the innovations of the secular element, which some two or

three centuries later allowed the marriage even of abbots and other laxities. There was, however, the singular arrangement of double monasteries, with monks and nuns under the same roof; one of the largest of these being the Abbey of Coldingham, where the brethren and sisters were governed by the abbess Æbba, and these mixed communities seem generally to have had an abbess for their superior instead of an abbot. One bishop was still in these days considered sufficient for the consecration of priests, and the Holy Eucharist was held to be the one great act of worship which alone, so to speak, was deserving of the name.

We now pass to the third period of the Celtic Church, that of the eremitical clergy. As usual at the commencement of a new epoch, we find one representative man, who gave a sudden impulse to that special form of lifelong devotion which sought God in absolute solitude and separation from the world. There had been from the first occasional instances of monks who became complete anchorites, but S. Cuthbert was the first who established the eremitical life as a system in the Celtic Church. His early history is very obscure, notwithstanding his important influence on the religion of his day. Mr. Skene rejects the legend of his having been trained along with S. Bridget, for the very sufficient reason that she died more than a century before he existed; but, after an exhaustive examination of the conflicting accounts he comes to the following conclusions:—S. Cuthbert was born about the year 626, the son of an Irish chieftain and an Aglic mother, and he was brought by the latter to Britain for his education. He was twenty-five years old before he became a monk, but he seems to have been religiously-minded from the first, since Bede states that 'on a certain night, when he was extending his long vigils in prayers, as was his wont, he had a vision, in which he saw the soul of Bishop Aidan of Lindisfarne being carried to heaven by choirs of the heavenly host,' and he resolved, in consequence, to enter a religious house and put himself under monastic discipline. Notwithstanding the great reputation of the Monastery of Lindisfarne at that period, Cuthbert chose in preference to enter the Abbey of Mailros (Melrose), 'allured by the fame of the exalted virtues of its prior, Boisil.' Ten years later Cuthbert himself became Prior of Melrose, on the death of Boisil, under the abbot Eata; but already during this interval he had for some time led the life of a solitary.

In the year A.D. 664 the Monastery of Lindisfarne was placed, at the suggestion of Bishop Colman, under the care of

Eata, who thus became abbot of that house, as well as of Melrose. He at once transferred his prior Cuthbert to Lindisfarne, 'there to teach the rules of monastic perfection with the authority of a superior, and to illustrate it by becoming an example of virtue ;' the saint remained twelve years in charge of this monastery, ruling it well and wisely, but throughout this period he was in the habit of constantly retiring to a solitary place on the rocky coast, in order 'to contend as a recluse with the invisible enemy by prayer and fasting.' Finally he seems to have been unable to withstand the irresistible impulse to live in absolute solitude with his God, in a spot remote from the abode of men. He chose for this purpose the island of Farne, distant nearly three miles from the mainland, and constructed in it an anchoret's cell, of which Bede gives an elaborate description. The wall of unwrought stones was circular, and Cuthbert made it very high by hollowing out the earth inside, in order, as his chronicler says, 'by this means to curb the petulance of his eyes as well as of his thoughts, and to raise his whole mind to heavenly desires,' since he could see nothing from his mansion but the sky. The cell was divided into two parts, an oratory and an ordinary dwelling-place, and there 'Cuthbert, the man of God,' abode in solitude eight years. He seems, however, to have seen his monks when they resorted to him for direction, and in this manner to have still governed his monastery. In the year 684 he was most reluctantly obliged to leave his beloved solitude, in consequence of his appointment as Bishop of Hagustald (Hexham), being, however, by an arrangement with Abbot Eata, almost immediately transferred to the bishopric of Lindisfarne. Cuthbert's consecration took place in the city of York ; seven bishops meeting at the consecration, 'among whom Theodore was Primate.' It is an interesting fact, not noticed by Mr. Skene, that this ceremony brought the Celtic Church indirectly into contact with the Orthodox communion of the East, the Primate being Theodore of Tarsus, whom the Eastern Church gave to her Western sister, and whose position as Archbishop of Canterbury is still looked upon as a connecting link between the Oriental Christians and ourselves.

It was only in the spirit of obedience that Cuthbert consented to accept the responsible office which drew him from his retirement, but he performed the duties imposed upon him with much zeal for two years. Then he felt that his end drew near, and desiring to meet death in holy solitude, he resigned his bishopric, after making a visitation of his diocese, and returned to his rude cell in the island of Farne. We have not

space for the beautiful account of his death, given by Herefrid, a monk who attended him to the last, but the manner in which his release was announced to the brethren in the Monastery of Lindisfarne is too striking to be omitted. Some of the monks had crossed from the other island, and had spent the night outside the cell in watching and prayer, and when they heard from Herefrid that the saint had expired—

‘it happened that in the order of nocturnal lauds they were at that moment chanting the sixtieth psalm, and forthwith one of them ran and lighted two candles, and holding one in each hand he went up to a higher place, to show to the brethren who remained in the Monastery of Lindisfarne that the holy soul of Cuthbert had now departed to the Lord, for such was the signal agreed upon among them to notify his most holy death. And when the monk who was intently watching afar off on the opposite watch-tower of the island of Lindisfarne saw this, for which he had been waiting, he ran quickly to the church, where the whole congregation of the monks were assembled to celebrate the solemnities of nocturnal psalmody, and it happened that they also, when he entered, were singing the before-mentioned psalm.’

The body of Cuthbert was then brought in a boat to Lindisfarne, and ‘deposited in a stone coffin in the Church of the Blessed Apostle S. Peter, on the right side of the altar.’

The life of solitary contemplation led by S. Cuthbert soon came to be recognised throughout the Celtic Church as beyond all question the highest form of religious asceticism. A writer of the seventh century classifies all monks at that time under three heads—the cœnobites, who lived together in the monasteries; hermits, belonging to no community, who withdrew into desert places; and anchorets, like Cuthbert, who, having been perfected in cœnobitical life, ‘shut themselves up in cells apart from the aspect of men, insensible to all, and living in the sole contemplation of God.’ These last were held to have chosen the more excellent way; they were spoken of as ‘saints who went from virtue to virtue, and the God of gods was seen of them in Zion.’ Finally, as the passionate impulse towards this life of lonely adoration spread far and wide throughout the Church, the vast numbers who adopted it were considered entitled to call themselves in a peculiar sense the ‘people of God.’ Their secret self-mortification and devotion was said to be a *cultus* or *religio* singularly acceptable to the Heavenly Father, and the name of *Deicolæ*—‘God-worshippers’—was given to them, as distinct from the *Christicola*, or cœnobitical monks, and also from ordinary Christians, who were sometimes included in

that appellation. This word *Deicola*, as applied to the anchorets, which Mr. Skene has unearthed in many corrupt forms from records in various languages, is one of great importance, inasmuch as it explains the term *Culdee*, which has been a subject of so much controversy.

In Irish, *Deicola* assumes the form of *Ceile De*, the name given to anchorets in Ireland, and in Scotland we find it in use as *Keledei*. At a later period the 'God-worshippers' of the Angles were called *Colidei*, and by a process of exhaustive research on this subject, Mr. Skene is enabled to give the following explanation of the origin of the mysterious Culdees:—

'The result, then, that we have arrived at is that the Culdees originally sprang from that ascetic order who adopted the solitary service of God in an isolated cell as the highest form of religious life, and who were termed *Deicola*; that they then became associated in communities of anchorets, or hermits; that they were clerics, and might be called monks, but only in the sense in which anchorets were monks; that they made their appearance in the eastern districts of Scotland at the same time as the secular clergy were introduced, and succeeded the Columban monks, who had been driven across the great mountain range of Drumalban . . . and that they were finally brought under the canonical rule along with the secular clergy, retaining, however, to some extent the nomenclature of the monastery, until at length the name of *Keledeus*, or Culdee, became almost synonymous with that of "secular canon."

As we pass down the centuries from the pure and primitive days of Columba and Cuthbert, we find the Celtic Church becoming greatly secularised. The Easter controversy which had even caused the existence of rival abbots at Iona for a period of seventy years, had generally impaired the integrity of monastic institutions, and the heads of religious houses were obliged to fall back on the rights and privileges inherited from the founders. The term *Coarb*, in connection with the name of some saint, came into use as the designation of the bishops or abbots who succeeded to his spiritual and temporal privileges, and eventually it became the title of the possessors of the land bearing the name of abbot, whether laymen or clerics; but gradually this mode of succession to the abbacy was superseded by one of a much less satisfactory nature.

The time had passed when the Church could remain wholly monastic, having all her clergy under rule as 'religious;' and by degrees a secular clergy were introduced into her constitutions, towards whom there was a strong reaction. This was due, perhaps, in part to the fact that the life of the anchorets, as the highest form of service to God,

was so far beyond what many even devout men could attempt. An effort was made on the Continent in the eighth century to draw the recluses and the secular clergy more into harmony with each other; for although at the opposite poles, so to speak, of the ecclesiastical system, they had yet in their independent existence one feature in common as distinct from the cœnobitical life of the monks.

In the year 747 Chrodigang, Bishop of Metz, founded an institution of secular canons, with a somewhat strict rule, which required, among other stringent obligations, that the canon clerics should live together in a cloister. The object of this rule undoubtedly was to bring the secular clergy to lead a cœnobitical life with such relaxations as would allow the recluses to be included within it; but it became very popular, and it was enlarged, so as to adapt it to the state of the clergy generally, and enable it to be extended over the whole Church. The order of secular canons was introduced into the Celtic Church both in Scotland and Ireland in the ninth century, and in process of time the severity of the monastic rule became so greatly relaxed by the influence of the secular clergy that marriage was gradually permitted even to monks, and became eventually quite general—the rebound towards a secular state being proportioned to the enforced strictness of the previous system. It then followed that spiritual succession to the abbacies was superseded by a direct descent from the ecclesiastical personages themselves, so that the Church offices became hereditary in their families. The next downward step was that the abbots and superiors did not take orders at all, but became virtually laymen—providing substitutes for the performance of the religious functions, but retaining the titles as well as the privileges and emoluments of the spiritual dignities. From these and many other indications of growing laxity, on which we have not space to enter, it is plain that during the centuries immediately following the introduction of the eremitical life, the Celtic Church lost much of her early freshness of grace and severe simplicity. Yet there were times during that long period when a bright light was shed upon her by the fire of persecution, which, amid many shades of error, brought out into strong relief the noble constancy and pure devotion still latent within her.

At the close of the eighth century, and throughout a great part of the ninth, we read of the spoliation of the religious houses and the slaughter of their inmates by those who are termed 'the Gentiles,' that is the Danish sea pirates, then spreading dismay throughout the whole of Britain. They

soon found that the monasteries offered the richest spoil, and directed their attacks against them, and many noble instances might be given of the courage and self-sacrifice with which the religious met the fury of the pagans. One of the most striking of these we must briefly touch upon, in order that a last gleam of heavenly radiance may rest on our picture of the Celtic Church before it fades away from our sight altogether.

Walafrid Strabo, who died in the year 849, tells us of a certain Blathmac, a prince of royal descent, heir to a throne in Ireland, who gave up his kingly rights to lead the life of a monk in the cloister. For a time he was abbot of a monastery in Ireland, but he was possessed with an unappeasable desire to perfect the offering of his love to Christ by undergoing the 'red martyrdom'—i.e. a death of violence in the Christian cause, in contradistinction to the 'white martyrdom,' which, we conclude, denoted that daily death in self-mortification spoken of by S. Paul when he said, 'I die daily.' In order to attain this height of perfection, Blathmac went, says his chronicler, 'to a certain island placed in the wave-tossed brine, called Iona, and this island he sought under his vow to suffer the marks of Christ, for there the frequent hordes of pagan Danes were wont to come, armed with malignant furies, and there he had not long to wait; the time soon came when the great mercy of our God decreed to associate His servant with His glorious hosts above the stars.' When the Danes were about to attack the island, Blathmac bade his brethren decide whether they would 'endure with him the coming fate, the imminent trial of certain death for the name of Christ, or seek their safety by timely flight;' and some, touched by his words, 'rejoiced with him to face the raging sword,' while others fled to places of refuge. Then came the fatal morning, and Blathmac stood before the holy altar to celebrate the Eucharistic sacrifice, 'himself a victim acceptable to God, to be offered up to the threatening sword.' Soon 'the cursed bands rushed raging through the unprotected houses, and, furious with rage—the rest of the brethren having been slain—came to the holy father,' demanding the shrine of precious stones and metals enclosing the bones of S. Columba; but he refused, 'standing firm before them with unarmed hands,' and said, 'Savagely bring your swords, seize their hilts, and kill.—O God, I commend my humble self to Thy protection.' On this 'the pious victim was cut in pieces,' and Blathmac obtained his desire of being a martyr for the cause of Christ.

Passing over the gradual decadence of the old Celtic Church, we come to her final disappearance, when she was at

last altogether superseded, and only the ruins of her desolate sanctuaries, and the old burial-places with their Celtic crosses, remained to speak of her witness to Christ in the dark centuries gone by. The causes which brought the Celtic Church to an end may be classed under two heads—internal decay and external change. Of the first we have already spoken, and the second is inaugurated by the appearance of one of the most striking figures in the history of the eleventh century—the saintly Margaret, Queen of Scotland, who became the wife of King Malcolm Canmore in 1069. The chroniclers bear unanimous testimony to the exalted character of this noble lady, as unsurpassed in devoted love to God, in entire self-abnegation, and in unwearied desire to benefit the people among whom her lot was cast. But, as a Saxon princess, she had been trained in the system of the great Roman Communion, which she therefore identified with the only true system, so that the Celtic Church, with which she was brought in contact in the land of her adoption, appeared to her to be in error wherever it diverged from it.

In her longing to bring her husband's subjects nearer to her God and theirs, the Queen therefore sought to establish the Roman authority as the one standard of right and wrong in such fashion as to render it logically certain that the Celtic must gradually become entirely incorporated with the Roman Church. The same policy was followed by her son David when he succeeded to the throne after the death of his elder brother Edgar, who seems to have been favourable to the native Church. In the reigns of David and his successors not only was the older ecclesiastical constitution superseded by the ordinary Roman system, but active war was waged against the Culdee establishments, and every effort made to suppress them entirely. A similar course was adopted by the Norman kings towards the religious institutions in Ireland; and when the process of internal decadence was thus accompanied by external aggression, it could only end in the final extinction of the old Celtic Church in its distinctive character. The last of the Coiumban Abbots of Iona died in the closing year of the eleventh century, and that powerful religious house was given over to the Benedictine monks. A few years later the line of native bishops came to an end. The Archbishop of York claimed supremacy over the episcopal sees of Scotland, and the diocese of Candida Casa (otherwise Whithorn) recognised his authority. The last trace of the struggle for independence vanished in the year 1188, when Pope Clement III., in a Bull addressed to King William the Lion, declared the

Church in Scotland to be 'the daughter of Rome by special grace, and immediately subject to her.'

And so it is that with the fair vision of the saintly Queen Margaret—*anima candida* indeed amid the lawless spirits of those evil times—the old Celtic Church, which first dawned on our view in the light of the Candida Casa, fades away from our sight, and disappears behind the stately Roman system which henceforth sat enthroned in her place.

Yet that ancient shrine of the Living God has left an imperishable memory, heritage of all Christians throughout the world in the undeniable witness she bears to the independence of the Churches of Christ in the earlier centuries of our era, and also to the Divine power of that pure Faith which, despite the feebleness of its human agencies and the strength of opposing forces, could penetrate the gross darkness of paganism, and finally dispel it altogether beneath the unobstructed rays of the Sun of Righteousness.

ART. VII.—CYPRUS.

1. *Cyprus, its Ancient Cities, Tombs, and Temples: a Narrative of Researches and Excavations.* BY GENERAL LOUIS PALMA DI CESNOLA. (London: Murray, 1877.)
2. *Histoire de l'Ile de Chypre sous le règne des Princes de la Maison de Lusignan.* Par M. L. DE MAS LATRIE. 3 vols. (Paris: à l'Imprimerie Impériale, 1852-61.)
3. *Creta, Cyprus, Rhodus, sive de nobilissimarum harum Insularum rebus et antiquitatibus.* Apud JOANNIS MEURSII Operum Volumen Tertium. (Florentiæ, 1744.)
4. *Cyprus.* By R. HAMILTON LANG, late H.M. Consul in the Island of Cyprus. In 'Macmillan's Magazine' for August and September, 1878.
5. *A Description of the East and some other Countries.* By RICHARD POCOCKE, LL.D., F.R.S. 3 vols. folio. (London, 1743.)

THE announcement that, by the Anglo-Turkish Convention, Cyprus had been ceded to the British Empire has naturally excited a lively interest in the past history and present condition of our new territory. To the inquiry, what is the best

book on Cyprus? it is not easy to give an unqualified reply. General Cesnola's volume, with its admirable and abundant illustrations, its rich-toned paper and beauteous type, not only ranks high as a *livre de luxe*, but also contains a vivid *résumé* of its past history, and a well-written and amusing description of the island under Turkish rule. No one will begin to read it without being carried on with unflagging interest to the end. But its speciality and *raison d'être* are the individual researches and discoveries of the energetic author. M. L. de Mas Latrie's volumes leave little to be desired by those who wish to investigate thoroughly the period of Lusignan rule in Cyprus, and who have ample leisure for the task. But, of the three volumes before us, the two most bulky comprise the original documents which M. de Mas Latrie has with remarkable perseverance and critical discernment selected from widely dispersed collections, and the third, although extending to more than 500 ample pages, yet only completes the first of the three centuries during which Lusignan kings reigned in the East. Mr. Lang's less pretentious pages, which are still in course of publication in *Macmillan's Magazine*, aim rather at describing the resources of the island, and at indicating the necessary administrative measures requisite to ensure its prosperity under our control. Mr. Lang writes in a pleasant style, is full of matter, and speaks with the authority of one who has enjoyed and turned to good account opportunities of being thoroughly acquainted, during a residence of nine years, with 'the country, its inhabitants, its capabilities, and its administration.' Of the other volumes named at the head of our paper, we will only say that Pococke will hardly afford new light to those who have any acquaintance with geography or history of the island; whilst Meursius is exclusively valuable for the industry, not always guided by critical knowledge, with which he has collected all that early writers have recorded about Cyprus; a task in which he has been followed and superseded by Engel.

'A glance at any map,' says Mr. Lang, 'will convince the most incredulous of the advantageous position which Cyprus occupies, both as a defence to the Suez Canal, and a possibly future Euphrates Valley Railway.' Nearly a century ago Louis XVI. of France sent M. Sonnini on a voyage through Greece and Turkey, and in the account of his travels, published on his return, under the *régime* of the Republic, he recommended the conquest of Cyprus as an indispensable starting point for the occupation of Egypt. About the same date the island was visited by Captain J. Taylor, who was attempting

the then most unwonted task of an overland journey to Bombay, and he immediately perceived its importance to the command of the Valley of the Euphrates. These authorities will suffice to prove that it is under no influence of party feeling that Englishmen may rejoice over the peaceable cession to them of the valuable prize whose past history and future prospects we will try, very briefly and imperfectly of course, to set before our readers.

The chain of historic interest which is associated with Cyprus is singularly complete. The island has been identified by modern as well as ancient archæologists with the Chittim and Caphtor of Holy Writ. The statement of Eusebius that the town of Paphos was founded by Israelites in the days of the first Judges is more questionable; but it is certain that its shores were the seat of Phœnician colonies full a thousand years before the Christian era, and their influence on Cypriote art and character may be traced down to comparatively modern times. Greek settlers soon realised and largely appropriated the value of the mineral and agricultural resources of a land which had been celebrated in the poetry of Homer, and visited in the wanderings of Menelaus and Ulysses. The Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian, Egyptian, Roman, Byzantine, and Mohammedan Empires each in turn exercised an important influence on its fortunes. It was the fabled birthplace of Venus, the last retreat of Solon, and the fatherland of Zeno. It was the scene of apostolic labour in the earliest days of the planting of Christianity and of the fostering care of the Empress Helena when the cross was first inscribed on the banner of the Empire. Our own Richard Cœur de Lion won it with characteristic energy, wedded his affianced bride, Berengaria of Navarre, at one of its altars, and sold it in unkingly fashion to Guy de Lusignan for a stipulated sum. Owing to the continuance of the Lusignan dynasty there for three centuries, the effect of the Crusades was more permanently felt in Cyprus than in any other portion of the Eastern Empire. Venice held it for a century beneath its sway. Nothing save the withering influence of Turkish rule could have severed for three hundred years from the stream of modern politics a country so exceptionally fortunate in geographical position and natural resources.

An unusual number of Greek names was assigned to the island, no less than 16 or 17 being recorded by Meursius; they denote its connection with the worship of Venus, its numerous promontories, and its singular fertility. The name Cyprus is variously derived from a legendary child of Ciny-

ras, from the copper in which it abounded, and from the henna plant (*Lawsonia alba*), so largely used as an Oriental cosmetic. The titles, too, of its cities bear witness to its varied fortunes. Citium, the modern Larnaca, is the Japathian Chittim; Paphos, Amathus, Idalium, and Golgos are of Phœnician; Neo-Paphos, Tembros, and Curium of Argive origin. Soli claims connection with Solon, the Athenian lawgiver; whilst Salamis recalls to every school-boy the hardships of Teucer, the son of Telamon. Pelasgians, Cilicians, Lycians, and Egyptians all in turn helped to people its shores. Modern philology is still successfully engaged in investigating the dark problems involved in so confused an intermixture of races, and a special Cypriote character—long presumed to be Phœnician—is being gradually deciphered by the united labours of English, German, and American scholars.¹

The civilisation of the Phœnician era in Cyprus corresponded with that of the Semitic races at Carthage and Tyre. There was the same spirit of industry and commerce; the same skill as artisans, smiths, and miners; the same devotion to pleasure, licentiousness, and blood. Gathered in towns along the coast, these early settlers felled the timber, with which the island was then covered, for their vessels, and became pre-eminent in shipbuilding and navigation. A Cypriote fleet co-operated with the army of Semiramis, as in later years with that of Alexander at the siege of Tyre. The Homeric story of the bad faith of Cinyras attests at once the skill of the Cypriotes at that early age as naval engineers and as workers in the terra-cotta figures, of which so many examples have been disinterred by Cesnola. The same Cinyras, the legendary hero of Cyprus, the inventor of hammer and anvil, and other tools for working metals, is also high-priest and favourite of Venus—a sort of Phœnician Vulcan with the characteristic qualities of artistic skill, Punic perfidy, and unbridled sensuality. 'The immoderate licentiousness of modern Malabar,' says Michelet, 'can alone recall the abominations of the Phœnicians.' What must have been the moral condition of a people whose principal worship was that of Mylitta, Aphrodite, or Venus, in which lust was sanctified, as Thuggism sanctified murder?

As Phœnician influence declined and that of the Greeks increased, nine towns in Cyprus rose to importance each as the seat of an independent kingdom. Citium and Amathus

¹ General Cesnola's handsome volume contains a series of inscriptions given in facsimile of the Cypriote character.

on the south coast ; Salamis on the east ; Curium, and afterwards Neo-Paphos, on the west ; Cerynia, Lapithos, and Soli on the north ; and Ledra on the site of Nicosia, the modern capital in the interior, were the capitals of these petty monarchies. The extraordinary fertility of the island enriched at this period a people animated by a spirit of enterprise, and for a brief period of thirty years the navies of Cyprus enjoyed the supremacy of the Mediterranean. But the enervating influences of the climate and of wealth only too easily acquired soon told with fatal effect. The ninth century B.C. was the culminating period of Cypriote prosperity. Sargon, the father of Sennacherib, gained a temporary mastery over the island B.C. 707. Apries, King of Egypt, the Pharaoh Hophra of Scripture, conquered some of its princes, and carried off much booty B.C. 594. Amasis, who put Apries to death, overran, according to Herodotus, and subjected to tribute the entire island.¹ From this date to the reign of Alexander the Great it was practically a dependency of Persia.

We are indebted to some fragments preserved in the strange medley left us by Athenæus for a few vivid touches, which sketch in rapid outline the typical tyrants of Cyprus. The portrait is one which might serve for many an Oriental despot of modern days, with its flaccid features of aimless extravagance and effeminate luxury. One tyrant in a drunken freak sold his royal authority for fifty talents, with which he retired to end his days at Amathus. Another is described by Clearchus as reclining on a couch with silver feet, placed on an exquisitely soft Sardinian carpet, with a coverlet of purple cloth, edged with scarlet fringe, and *three purple pillows beneath his head*, made of the finest linen, to keep him cool ; two more of scarlet supporting his feet, as he lies clad in a robe of spotless white. Behind his couch are slaves in short tunics, and close to him his three principal attendants ; one nursing his master's feet, another gently holding his hand, rubbing it and stretching the fingers ; and the third, with his left hand smoothing the young prince's hair, whilst with his right he languidly waves a Phœcean fan.

Antiphanes, another writer quoted by Athenæus, gives a yet stranger illustration of Paphian luxury. The poetic rendering from Mr. Yonge's translation preserves much of the spirit of the original :—

In Paphos, where you should have seen the luxury
That did exist, or you would not believe it.

¹ Cesnola, p. 23.

. The king was fanned
 While at his supper by young turtle-doves
 And by nought else
 He was anointed with a luscious ointment
 Brought up from Syria, made of some rich fruit,
 Which, they do say, doves love to feed upon.
 They were attracted by the scent, and flew
 Around the royal temples ; and had dared
 To seat themselves upon the monarch's head :
 But that the boys who sat around with sticks
 Did keep them at a slight and easy distance.
 And so they did not perch, but hover'd round,
 Neither too far, nor yet too near, still fluttering,
 So that they raised a gentle breeze to blow
 Not harshly on the forehead of the king.

It is not surprising to learn that despots so worthless and effeminate lived in constant fear of insurrection. Gradually suspicion, fostered by their courtiers for interested reasons, moulded the policy of the Cypriote kings into a peculiar form, under which the espionage of their own subjects was reduced to a system, of which Clearchus gives the following description.

'All the monarchs of Cyprus have encouraged a race of high-born flatterers as useful to them ; for they are a possession very appropriate to tyrants. And, as is the case with the Areopagites, no one knows their number nor their persons, except a few of the most prominent of them. Now the flatterers of Salamis (from whom the flatterers throughout the rest of Cyprus are sprung) are divided according to their families into two classes, one they call Gergini, and the other Promalanges. The Gergini associate with the people in the city, and go about as eavesdroppers and spies in the workshops and markets ; and whatever they hear they report daily to those who are called their kings. And the Promalanges make inquiry about anything which has been reported by the Gergini which they consider worthy of investigation. And they conduct themselves with such craft and gentleness, that I believe what they themselves assert, viz. that from them the race of notable flatterers has been handed to distant countries.'¹

The dreary record of luxurious self-indulgence and nerveless inactivity is agreeably relieved in the fourth century B.C. by the episode of Evagoras, a prince of the house of Teucer, whose ancestors had been driven from their hereditary kingdom of Salamis. Cesnola briefly relates his story, which has all the air of a popular legend. The length of the period during which the dynasty of Teucer was dethroned is very uncertain.

¹ Athenæus, vi. c. 67.

'It seems, however, to be certain that, with the help of the Persians, a Tyrian named Abdemon had seized the throne, and not only paid tribute to Persia, but endeavoured to extend the Persian power over the rest of the island. To Salamis itself he invited Phœnician immigrants, and introduced Asiatic tastes and habits, so that apparently all previous efforts to give a firm Hellenic character to the town were rendered futile. But, meantime, there was growing up a spirited boy, who traced his descent from the line of Teucer, and in whom were combined the highest natural gifts. Bodily, he had no rival in beauty, or strength, or skill; mentally, he was endowed with all that was necessary for a great leader. Such is, in brief, the description which the ancients have left us of Evagoras. Abdemon, the Tyrian usurper, saw how the presence of this youth captivated the people of Salamis, and took measures to be rid of him effectually. But the scheme was discovered, and Evagoras escaped to Cilicia, where he gradually collected round his person a band of fifty faithful friends, ready for any service to which he might call them. Crossing from Cilicia, they obtained during the darkness entrance at one of the gates of Salamis, and, amid general alarm and confusion, fought their way against great odds to the citadel and seized it. There appears to have been little further resistance. Evagoras became king, and from the beginning to the end of his reign spared nothing to make Salamis a flourishing and powerful city.'—Cesnola, p. 200.

The throne so romantically recovered had long to be held against the whole power of the Persian monarchy, and despite the discouragement caused by the desertion of allies. When peace was finally concluded, Evagoras was left in undisturbed possession of Salamis, after a ten years' contest, which had cost the Persians 50,000 talents.

We are constrained to pass over the subsequent fortunes of Cyprus until it fell under the iron sway of Rome. During the struggles between the generals of Alexander, it was the occasion of a fierce conflict between Ptolemy and Antigonus, each of whom made extraordinary efforts to secure so rich a prize. It eventually became a dependency of Egypt, and was generally governed by some member of the royal family as viceroy—the last of whom, an uncle of Cleopatra, incurred the enmity of Clodius, under circumstances with which every one is familiar, and in revenge the Roman demagogue procured the passing of a decree by which Cyprus was annexed to Rome. This unscrupulous measure was strongly opposed and disapproved by Cato; but when its execution was committed to him, he carried it out with his wonted integrity and energy. The spoil was sold for 7,000 talents, all of which Cato sent into the treasury of the republic, retaining only for himself a statuette of Zeno. It is said that the stern censor feared the possible effect on the Romans of a public display of the

vessels of gold and silver, the treasures of jewellery and stuffs of priceless tissue, the costly furniture and equipage found in Cyprus, so that he only allowed the chests containing the money they had produced to be borne in his triumph.

The way for the introduction of Christianity had been prepared by the settlement of a large Jewish population in the island, and Barnabas, a Levite of Cyprus, was conspicuous among the early converts. In Salamis the Jews had several synagogues (Acts xiii. 5), and it has been conjectured with much probability that the farming of the copper mines by Augustus and Herod may have helped to increase their numbers. In Cyprus, as elsewhere, Jewish turbulence was repressed with stern Roman severity. In the reign of Trajan the Jews rose in insurrection.

‘One Artemio placed himself at their head. They massacred 240,000 of their fellow-citizens; the whole populous city of Salamis became a desert. The revolt of Cyprus was suppressed; Hadrian, afterwards emperor, landed on the island and marched to the assistance of the few inhabitants who had been able to act on the defensive. He defeated the Jews, expelled them from the island, to whose beautiful coasts no Jew was ever after permitted to approach. If one were accidentally wrecked on the inhospitable shore he was instantly put to death.’—Milman, *History of the Jews*, iii. 111, 112, quoted by Conybeare and Howson.

The fanaticism of the Jews had doubtless been aroused by cruel ill-treatment, and the sea that broke upon the shores of Cyprus had run red with their blood.

From the time of Trajan to that of Constantine there are but brief records of events in Cyprus, and the scanty annals are full of disaster. A terrible drought prevailed for seventeen consecutive years at the commencement of the fourth century. The harvest failed, and the famished inhabitants fled in such numbers that the chroniclers of the time speak of the island as utterly depopulated. Touched at the sight of such wide-spread desolation, the Empress Helena, on returning from her pilgrimage to Jerusalem, spared neither gifts nor prayers for its relief. Scarce had she disembarked, when at her intercession abundant rain fell from heaven upon the thirsty land. At her instance, the Emperor Constantine remitted their taxes to all Cypriotes who returned to their farms, and gave free grants of land to settlers from Syria and Asia Minor. With a lavish hand she not only founded churches and religious houses, but strove to secure their lasting prosperity by gifts of priceless relics. On Mount Olympus, within the area of the ruined temple of Jupiter,

she laid the first stone of a church which was to be largely constructed of the displaced marbles of the heathen fane, and endowed it with the cross on which the penitent thief had expired. Thenceforth the peak has been called Mount Santa Croce. 'Camps of Cæsar,' says M. de Mas Latrie, 'are not more plentiful in France than traces of S. Helena's bounty in Cyprus.' To her the church at Kouklia, erected on the site of the temple of Venus at Paphos, owes the dust that fell from the Cross itself, and that of Omodos not only a fragment of the true Cross itself, but part of the cords wherewith the Holy Sufferer was bound. The ruthless hand of time and of Turkish misrule has now involved heathen and Christian temple alike in one incongruous ruin.

No less than fourteen bishoprics existed in Cyprus in the days of Constantine, and this eventually became the fixed number of its dioceses—a number which the Greek Christians religiously endeavoured to maintain against ill-judged innovations of the Roman Church in later days. A serious question as to its ecclesiastical independence was raised by the claim of the Patriarch of Antioch to extend his jurisdiction over the island, and the suit was contested with varying fortune, until the timely discovery by a peasant of the body of S. Barnabas with a copy of S. Matthew's Gospel lying on his breast, and the judicious offer of so inestimable a treasure to the Emperor Zeno, who was arbiter of the dispute, effectually turned the scale in favour of Cyprus. Zeno not only confirmed the independence of Cyprus, but granted special privileges to the Archbishop, which he still retains. 'Amongst these were the assumption of purple silk robes, the insignium of a gold-headed sceptre, the title of Beatitude, and the privilege, only customary with the emperors, of signing in red ink.'

The annals of Cyprus for the next five hundred years are singularly meagre. M. Mas de Latrie assures us that its condition at this period justifies the expression, 'Happy is the people that have no history!' The contending powers of Islam and of the Eastern Empire were too fully occupied to turn their attention to Cyprus, and the island enjoyed a season of peaceful prosperity, which was enhanced by the introduction of the silk-worm by Justinian I. (whose name and that of his queen, Theodora, was long dear to the Cypriotes), as well as by the arrival of many industrious refugees from the desolated provinces of Armenia and Syria. In this dearth of more stirring incidents, the legend of the foundation of the monastery of Kykkou, recorded by Mas Latrie, gives a striking picture of the thoughts and habits of the time.

About the year 1092, Manuel Voutomitis, Duke of Cyprus, was hunting in the mountains of Myrianthoussa. There, in the midst of forests still abounding in deer, were a great number of religious communities and solitary oratories, where holy anchorites lived secluded from the world. One of these monks, named Isaiah, terrified at meeting the duke, turned hurriedly from the path without saluting the *cortège*. Voutomitis ran after him, severely reprimanded, and even went so far as to kick him. The foot which struck the holy man instantly withered, and Voutomitis only obtained its restoration by promising to bring to Cyprus the very portrait of the Virgin painted by S. Luke, and called the Eleousa, which the emperors of Constantinople guarded in the palace. Alexis Comnenus, when solicited by both Voutomitis and Isaiah, who came together to carry out so difficult a negotiation, could not be induced to agree to such a sacrifice. After long waiting, Isaiah was about to return to Cyprus without the picture, when first the emperor's daughter, and then Alexis himself, were seized with the same malady that had struck Voutomitis. Alexis was terrified by so ominous a seizure, and his hesitation was finally removed by an apparition of the Virgin, who promised to restore him to health if he complied with the prayers of Isaiah. The gift of the holy picture was accompanied by a grant of money to erect a religious house on the site of Isaiah's cell, and from that time forward Our Lady of Kykkou became a favourite object of veneration in Cyprus. Riches and lands poured in upon the monastery, whose possessions extended to Constantinople, Smyrna, Thessaly, and even Russia. In times of severe drought the holy picture is borne with much ceremony into the open country, and no one can deprive the Cypriote of his conviction that it will, if he deserves it, obtain by its intercession the needed rainfall. Even the Mussulman holds the Eleousa in high reverence, and bows his turbaned head as she passes by; and many a secret offering is sent her from the harem, with a prayer for the healing of a child or for the gift of maternity.

The arrival of the Crusaders was far from being regarded with unmixed satisfaction by the Oriental Christians, and smouldering suspicion often broke out into open hostility. The proud contempt of Eastern refinement was repaid with interest by that of Frank intrepidity. The royal line of Constantinople had been stained by every crime and polluted by every vice, and Isaac Comnenus, a scion of the Imperial family, had seized the island of Cyprus, and was reigning there as an independent sovereign, when a part of the fleet of

Richard Cœur de Lion was wrecked upon its shores. The shipwrecked Crusaders were plundered, roughly handled, and then carried off as prisoners to Limasol, and permission to land or even to anchor in calm water was at first inhospitably refused to the vessel which bore Queen Berengaria and her sister, and was subsequently, if we are to credit the Frank historians, only offered with the intention of extorting a heavy ransom for them, as soon as they were in his power. Richard was anxious not to be delayed upon his way to join the French King at St. Jean d'Acre, and hoped by a personal interview with Isaac Comnenus to come to terms. But the wily Greek was only trifling in order to gain time. He met Richard with apparent frankness, suggested reasonable objections to the proposal that he should join his forces to those of the Crusaders, charmed the Western monarch by his engaging manners and the implicit confidence with which he voluntarily offered to place his daughter as a hostage in Richard's hands, and then decamped in the night, but half-dressed, and at full speed, to rejoin his army at Kolossi. The first shock of the opposing armies was unfavourable to Isaac, whose cause did not inspire any enthusiasm amongst a people who regarded him as an usurper and a tyrant. A few days sufficed for the subjugation of the open country, and the fortresses unbarred their portals at the bidding of the vanquished prince, whose banner was laid by King Richard on his return home on the tomb of his patron saint at Bury St. Edmunds.

The pages of M. de Mas Latrie recount in ample detail the events which led to the establishment of Guy de Lusignan first as king of Jerusalem, and then as lord of Cyprus. On leaving the island Richard I. had entrusted the charge of it to the Knights Templars as a gage for a large sum of money they advanced to him; but their rule provoked so much discontent that they were eager to resign their trust and to recover their loan, when Guy de Lusignan offered to discharge their claim, and to pay a further sum for the sovereignty they esteemed so lightly. The distinctive feature of the new Cypriote kingdom was the authority enjoyed by the High Court of the realm. All knights holding their fiefs direct from the crown were by right members of this body; whose power was independent of and superior to that of the sovereign. Privileges and protective rights, carefully defined, guaranteed the lieges individually, and the High Court collectively, against any exercise of arbitrary authority by the king. And, although the moderation and ability of many of

the Lusignan princes, and the indifference of the Cypriote nobles, gradually increased the influence of the monarchy, yet, even as late as the fourteenth century, the aristocracy as represented by the High Court of Nicosia retained the principal power, and the real direction of the State.

It is with surprise we learn that no ecclesiastic, whatever his rank, was allowed to be a member of the High Court. Yet, despite such restrictions upon its authority, monarchy in Cyprus was surrounded by much pomp and splendour. A numerous retinue of knights and men-at-arms always accompanied the prince. When he rode out running footmen went before his horse and drove back the crowd. It was customary in approaching him to bend on one knee, and to address him in the most respectful terms, as Monsignor, or Sire, or your Lordship. The title of your Majesty was hardly used in Cyprus before the fourteenth century.

The Latin occupation of Cyprus led to the introduction of the Roman Church upon the island, and with its wonted disregard of the rights of independent Churches, the Papacy intruded prelates of its own choice and communion. At first the Roman bishops were content to be associated with the rightful Greek holders of the same titles and dioceses. Gradually they supplanted and dispossessed them. Ere long the Franks became more hateful to the Greeks than the Saracens. In a letter written in 1196, Neophyte, a Cyprian monk, exults in the failure of the Crusades—'No, it has not pleased the Divine goodness to chase the dogs from the Holy City, in order to instal the wolves in their place.' All the skill and authority of Innocent III. were called into exercise to maintain the pretensions of Rome without utterly alienating the Greek Christians, and to arrange the questions of investiture which arose from time to time; but Latin predominance was, in 1211, already assured. Our readers will hold with M. de Mas Latrie that the following account, written by Count Wildebrand of Oldenburg, a canon of Hildesheim in Hanover, who passed this year through Cyprus, is invaluable for the light it casts upon this period:—

'From Gorgihos,' says Wildebrand, 'we passed to Cyprus, an island of great fertility, and where they grow exquisite wines. It has an archbishop and three Latin bishops; the Greeks, who have to acknowledge their supremacy, have thirteen bishops, one of whom is an archbishop. The Franks are masters of this country: the Greeks, as well as the Armenians, are their subjects, and pay them tribute as their serfs. This whole population is wretched, badly clothed, addicted to idleness, which is doubtless to be attributed to the hot wine

of the country, or rather to those who drink it. The island contains plenty of donkeys and wild sheep, of stags and fallow deer; but there are neither bears, nor lions, nor any other kind of ferocious animal. The first place at which we went on shore was Cerines, a small fortified town with a good harbour—of which it is immensely proud and a castle surrounded by ramparts garnished with towers. The King of Cyprus possesses four strong castles in this part of the island. . . . On quitting Cerines we came to Nicosia, situate almost in the centre of a vast plain. It is not protected by fortifications; but they are now building a strong castle. It is the capital of the kingdom. Its inhabitants are innumerable and extremely rich. Their houses, by their paintings and the interior ornaments with which they are decorated, much resemble those at Antioch. This place is the seat of the archiepiscopal see, of the royal court, and of the palace of the king. It was in this palace that I, for the first time in my life, saw an ostrich. From Nicosia we betook ourselves to Limasol, in order to see the cross of the thief who was crucified on the right hand of Our Lord. From the top of Santa Croce we could discern Paphos, where may still be seen the very tower on which, in the days of the Gentiles, Venus was worshipped.—Mas Latrie, i. pp. 186–7.

One special feature of Latin rule in the East deserves more than the passing mention to which our space restrains us. The Knights Templars had made themselves unpopular in Cyprus, and had been, ere this period, crushed by the enmity of Clement V.; but the Hospitallers had acquired so strong a footing in the island that they might have involved its monarchy in serious jeopardy if they had not made Rhodes the centre of their community and of the vast influence which they exercised through Christendom. A romantic interest attaches to these fraternities, half monks, half soldiers. The Templars and the Hospitallers, says a writer of the thirteenth century, are the true champions of the Lord. Clad in their white mantles marked with a red cross, and preceded by the 'Beaucéant,' their black and white standard, they advance silently in the battle, always in close array and in good order. They utter no battle cry; only when the trumpet of their chief sounds the assault, they lower their lances and charge as they recite a verse from the Psalms—'O Lord, grant us the victory; not for our sake, but for the glory of Thy Holy Name.' They always fall upon the enemy's strongest position, and never give way: they must either carry it or be slain. The Hospitallers, clothed in black, marked with a white cross, specially concerned themselves with the care of the sick and the poor; but, equally with the Templars, they had their place in every campaign. They ordinarily formed

the advanced guard at the commencement of a march, and the rear-guard on its return.

The Hospitallers of Cyprus occupied an important position under the style of the Great Commandership. It was their special privilege to be exempt from ordinary Customs duties, and to grind their corn free of charge at the royal mills. They possessed large estates, especially in vineyards, which still produce a wine called 'Le vin de Commanderie.' These estates became, at the Turkish conquest of the island, and still remain, the personal property of the Sultan.

We cannot linger over the story of the Lusignan dominion in Cyprus. The reader who wishes to enter fully into its history can peruse the fascinating pages of M. de Mas Latrie's history, and satisfy himself of its authenticity by studying the ample volumes of documents by which every detail is supported. Unhappily, M. de Mas Latrie's task is as yet only partly accomplished, and we much fear that the comprehensive scheme he has drawn out will hardly admit of full completion within ordinary limits of time or space. General Cesnola's introductory chapter gives a brief but clear narrative of the closing years of the Lusignan dynasty, and of the circumstances under which it passed under the dominion of Venice. The last Lusignan king, James II., was of illegitimate birth.

'He had seen the portrait of a niece of Cornaro, a Venetian nobleman at his court, and fell in love with her. . . . He formally asked her hand from the Senate of Venice, a request which, with a gravity suitable to the nature of the proceedings, was granted. A dowry of a hundred thousand gold ducats was bestowed on the bride. She was adopted as a daughter of the State, and sent to Cyprus with a splendid retinue.'—Pp. 34-5.

The Venetian bride was soon left a widow, and a posthumous son she bore to her husband quickly followed his father to the grave.

After reigning alone for sixteen years, Catherine resigned her crown in favour of Venice in the year 1489. The beautiful town of Asolo was assigned to her. 'There she lived for many years the centre of no little romantic sentiment and of some legends which yet survive.'

The period of Venetian rule in Cyprus was undisturbed by events of public interest, until the increasing power of the Turks justified the most serious alarm. Turkish pirates ravaged her ports, and the Sultan, Selim II., formally demanded the cession of the island. It is strange that under such conditions an energetic effort was not made to fortify

and garrison Cyprus, as both Spain and the Pope had promised their assistance. Was it indecision or misunderstanding or treachery which paralysed the arm of Christendom, permitted the Turks to land their forces unopposed, and failed to relieve the gallant but ineffectual resistance of Bragadino? The ruthless slaughter of 20,000 persons at Limasol and the treacherous and cold-blooded murder of Bragadino, on his capitulation, were but a foretaste of Turkish cruelty, perfidy, and misrule. In vain the loss of Cyprus seemed to be avenged by the victory of Lepanto. The latter, said a Turkish prisoner, 'is to the Sultan but as the loss of his beard, which will soon grow again: the former is to Venice the loss of an arm, which can never be recovered.'

A country which has experienced such varied fortunes and has been subject in turn to so many distinct races may be expected to be exceptionally rich in antiquities, and General Cesnola's work contains a graphic account of the thoroughness with which his researches were prosecuted, the difficulties which he encountered, and the great success which he achieved. It is a singular fact that in Cyprus there are more perfect remains of the earlier periods than of those who are less remote. This is partly to be accounted for by the eagerness with which the Greek inhabitants assisted the Turks in destroying the Latin churches and every other memorial of the hated Latin rule; and partly by the care with which some of the most ancient treasures were concealed, as well as by the sanctity assigned by the heathen populations to the burying-places in which so large a portion of the recently-discovered antiquities were found. The eagerness with which the consuls of different States vie with one another in their desire to secure these precious relics is such as to kindle the astonishment and distrust of the Turks, and at times leads to ludicrous results. When General Cesnola was exploring the neighbourhood of Dali (Idalium) he visited Potamia, formerly a royal residence of the Lusignan princes, and now

'belonging to three notable Turks. In returning their visit, I was served (says Signor Cesnola) coffee and sweetmeat as is the custom in the East, and to my surprise I remarked that the silver teaspoon I used had the lion of St. Mark and a royal crown engraved upon it. I asked Mehemet Effendi if he would part with that and the other spoons I supposed he possessed, but he declined, though as a Turkish compliment he offered me as a present the spoon I had used, which, of course, I refused. . . . I repeated my visit there at other times, but the teaspoons with the royal crown had disappeared.'—*Cyprus*, p. 98, note.

No wonder that suspicion was aroused by General Cesnola's extensive and systematic excavations, and only the positive terms of the firman from the Sultan could have ensured the prosecution of his work. The Turks complained that this Christian dog was digging up the whole island, and the continuous employment of 1,100 excavators might well seem to justify their remonstrances. The Governor-General accordingly summoned the Grand Council, who recommended that the excavations should be stopped, and that application should be made to Constantinople for further instructions.

'In accordance with this advice, I received a few days later an official despatch from his Excellency, informing me of the Council's decision, and enclosing in it, for my consideration, a copy of the Masbatta or document he had received from the Council on the subject. He added that he had received my letter requesting the loan of twelve tents for the use of my diggers while at Aghios Photios, and that he had given orders that they should be sent to me without delay; the incongruity of this with the official despatch was thoroughly Turkish.'—*Cyprus*, pp. 146-7.

General Cesnola himself must tell the artifices by which he overcame this and many other hindrances. Suffice it to say that American acuteness proved in every case a match for Turkish chicanery. But the story of the final despatch of the collections is too tempting to be omitted. The General held the twofold dignity of Russian and American Consul in Cyprus. The fame of his success as an explorer had reached Constantinople, and the cupidity of the Turk was aroused. Positive orders were despatched forbidding the embarkation of the collection. The boxes were all ready to be shipped, and there was the vessel waiting to receive them. Worst of all, a Turkish man-of-war unexpectedly arrived with political prisoners, and lay at anchor in the bay.

'I sat pondering moodily, Besbes looking at me through his great blue spectacles and red-rimmed eyes and impassable aspect (he is one of the ugliest men I think I ever saw, but at the same time one of the most faithful). "Besbes," said I, "these antiquities must and shall go on board the schooner this day." Suddenly I saw a sort of twinkle in his eyes, and a curious expression dawned on his lips as he said, looking very meekly at me, "Effendi, those telegrams are to prevent the American consul from shipping antiquities," and then he stopped. I replied with some heat, "You seem to take pleasure in repeating the information to me—I should think I ought to be aware of it by this time." Besbes did not lose a particle of his equanimity, but only said still more meekly, "There was nothing in those orders *about the Russian Consul*." I understood then what he meant, though my Western civilisation would never have arrived at this truly

Oriental solution of the difficulty. "Right," I cried, "go quickly to the custom-house and tell the Director "that I wish to see his two telegrams." Shortly afterwards that official arrived, and very politely requested Besbes to read and to translate them for me. When he had finished I asked "Have you any orders to prohibit the Russian consul from exporting antiquities?" He thought for a moment, and declared that they were clearly for the American consul only, and admitted that he could not refuse to give me the permission, should I ask for it in the usual official manner as consul for Russia. Fifteen minutes after this I had the order in my hand, and all the *facchini* of Larnaca at work rapidly removing the cases to the lighters. Five hours afterwards all my cases were on board; the schooner, now laden to the water's edge, left for Alexandria, where they were to be re-shipped for London.'—*Cyprus*, pp. 146-7.

No adequate idea can be formed of the natural resources of Cyprus from its actual condition when handed over to Sir Garnet Wolseley. The system of Turkish taxation was ingeniously oppressive and admirably calculated to crush all enterprise. Under the Ptolemies it sustained a million inhabitants, and could easily do so again. Mr. Lang enumerates grain, wine, seeds, locust beans, cotton, madder, tobacco, silk, and salt, as its most important products, and all these admit of immense development. Not one-tenth of the land is cultivated, and even that very imperfectly. The production of its wines, a growth the parent of and similar to Madeira, might be increased fiftyfold. The copper mines are, there is every reason to believe, far from being exhausted, and under scientific treatment may be expected to be very lucrative. Little is wanted beyond the protection of an enlightened government to restore again its former prosperity. It must not, however, be expected that the effects of centuries of misrule can be effaced in a day. The force of ignorance and prejudice which led General Cesnola's excavators to refuse to use a spade or a wheelbarrow will only gradually be overcome. The persistency of habit which to-day clothes the Greek peasantry in the headgear, and equips the water-carrier after the fashion of Phœnician times, will only gradually bend before the introduction of new customs. Happily the people are of gentle disposition, very easily governed, and singularly honest. Mr. Lang records—

'During the Abyssinian war, I purchased for the British Government, in the course of a month, over 2,000 mules in all parts, even the most remote, of the island. The money went in English sovereigns into the interior by native hands before the animals came forward, but not a pound went astray, nor did one of the many agents to whom the purchases were entrusted defraud me of a farthing.'

A yet more striking tribute to the character of the Cypriotes is borne by Mr. Lang's account of their patient endurance of intense suffering. Liability to prolonged seasons of drought and to ravages of locusts are the chief disadvantages to which the island is liable, and the latter plague may be, as experience has proved, very largely lessened by energetic measures. To obviate the frequent recurrence of droughts and to mitigate their consequences will be a harder task, but one not beyond the powers of an intelligent government. Much may be done in this direction by encouraging the planting of trees and the construction of reservoirs. Yet so serious have been the injuries inflicted by these two causes that Mr. Lang asserts—

‘The wonder is, not that the Cyprian peasant is at the lowest ebb of prosperity, but that the island is not one vast desolate waste. And if it is not, we owe it to the patience under suffering and the almost superstitious submission to a Divine will which are remarkable characteristics of the Cypriote character. During the summer of 1870, a large portion of the peasants lived chiefly upon roots of all kinds which they dug up in the fields. It was sad to see the long lines of these poor people arriving daily at the market places with their trinkets and copper household vessels for sale, in order to carry back with them a little flour for their famishing families. And yet there was no bitterness in their heart, no cursing of their sad fate. The exclamation which you heard from every man during these weary months of hardship was no other than—“O Theos mas lipithee,” May God have compassion on us! Never did I feel touched by, and never do I expect to join in, such a refrain of joy as when one morning, about 2 o'clock, the first blessed drops of rain fell which had been seen during twelve months; and when they increased to a torrential shower, men, women, and children, with torches in the dark of night, repaired to the mouth of the watershed to clear away every impediment which might delay the water in reaching their parched fields. It was a strange and touching sight. There was no drunken revelling, but the childlike gratitude in every heart was at every moment heard in the passionate “Doxa se O Theos!” The Lord be praised!’

Much discussion has been raised about the climate, in consequence of the sickness prevalent amongst our troops soon after their landing; but the concurrent testimony to the healthiness of Cyprus is conclusive. Exposure to excessive heat should be carefully avoided, and temperance is essential. The natives are singularly abstemious and observe the numerous fasts of the Greek Church most scrupulously. The extreme dryness of the climate, which admits of living in the open air from June to September, cannot fail to be healthy, if

only ordinary sanitary rules are not disregarded, a matter in which Orientals are sadly at fault. During these months the peasantry often encamp out of doors beneath the trees, whose branches serve for clothes-press, larder, and pantry. With such habits sickness is rare, and the people attain to a hearty old age. Fruit of every kind and of the finest quality is produced, and it excites envious feelings to read of orchards strewn with magnificent oranges left to rot upon the ground, because they were not worth the cost of gathering and conveying to the coast, the trees themselves being only cultivated for their blossoms, from which exquisite orange-flower water is distilled. The flora of the island is most varied and abundant, and has been famed from classic days, when its scarlet lychnis was in great request for garlands. A modern traveller, Herr Löher, describes them as meeting the eye in every direction. On the sea-shore at Larnaca every step was carpeted with tulips, daffodils, and hyacinths; whilst palms and masses of the Indian cactus overhung the path. In Nicosia, the capital, a town of gardens and fountains, as you pass down the street the blossoms of pear and apple are mingled in the gardens on either side with rosemary and figs, whilst orange, lemon, and mulberry trees line the streets. On passing through the valley that leads to Mount Olympus, oak and olive, myrtle and laurel abounded, and thousands of white lilies lined each side of the road.

We cannot now touch upon the many other topics of interest over which we are tempted to linger. We are constrained to omit all account of the towns of modern Cyprus, or the mode of travelling so picturesquely described by Mr. Lang and General Cesnola, and which is destined doubtless soon to disappear with the introduction of British capital and the erection of hotels. We must send our readers to Cesnola's own pages to learn about the magnificent gold treasures discovered at Curium, and there to lament over the mischance which deprived this country of a collection, placed by its discoverer at our disposal, and destined to become of special interest to us. The contact of our Church again with that of the Greek communion presents another subject of far-reaching interest and importance, which the limit of our space obliges us to pass by. All thoughtful men will feel that a great opportunity and corresponding responsibilities are now laid at our doors. When regarded fairly and broadly, British empire in the East, despite its many failings and shortcomings, has been a source of immense blessing to the people brought beneath its sway. We trust that the expe-

rience gained in other fields will enable us to bring renewed prosperity to the Cypriotes, and to do our duty honestly to those whose destinies have so strangely and so suddenly been placed under our rule.

ART. VIII.—THE LANCASHIRE COTTON STRIKE.

1. *The Practical Manufacturer and Journal of the Manchester Museum of Trade Patterns*. No. 1. Vol. I. May 1878. (Published at 6, Union Street, Manchester.)
2. *Cotton ; its Growth, Manufacture, and Commerce* : the Journal of the Cotton Trade and its Allied and Auxiliary Industries, from October 1877 to July 1878, both inclusive. (Manchester and London.)
3. The Contemporaneous Issues of the *Manchester Guardian* and *Blackburn Standard* during April, May, and June 1878.

MEASURED by its social consequences and tested by the *animus* which attended it, the great Lancashire 'strike' of 1878 must be chronicled alike as a crime and a blunder. The extent to which it unhinged society in the great cluster of towns which reach from the central to south-western and south-eastern Lancashire, is hardly conceivable to outsiders. Nine-tenths of the population straitened for food, taxing public and private local resources 'to keep the wolf from the door,'—nay, reaching their hungry clutches far and wide into 'the basket and the store' of other industrial associations ; beggars swarming in the streets ; all the hungry ne'er-do-well's of each populous township finding a 'good cry' and making the utmost of their new pretence of vagrancy ; mendicity and mendacity partners in a thriving trade—the only trade left ; the vacuum which nature abhors manifested at once in the visage, the stomach, the pocket, the till ; military repression grappling with civil discord ; the public character of a peaceful, law-abiding population thrown away ; the wild beast of human nature at its worst, unchained and rampant in riot, wrecking, street fights, and incendiarism : all this is the burden of our story. Taking the mischief only which can be measured in money—a very small portion probably of the

whole—there must be in wages unearned and property destroyed a blank somewhere of half a million in the revenue of the county of Lancaster, and a gap of a quarter of a million at least in its capital. Altogether, its people might as well have sunk some three-fourths of a million in the Irish Sea.

Of the waste of resources attendant upon the struggle one sure index may be found in the increased burden thereby cast upon the rates. We will take the single area of the Preston Union for the week ending Saturday, June 22. The *Guardians'* minutes show that there were then 1816 persons receiving relief at a cost of 131*l.* 2*s.* 11*d.*, whereas in the corresponding week of last year there were only 481 at a cost of 41*l.* 4*s.*, or that for that week the labour stoppage was inflicting a burden of more than threefold severity on the rate-payers. Again, in the Blackburn Union, for the week ending May 25, when the course of the strike was about midway run, we find 3,481 persons relieved at a cost of 214*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.*, whereas in the corresponding week of last year there were only 1,864 persons relieved at a cost of 135*l.* 5*s.* 10*d.* It is added, moreover, that of these recipients of relief at Blackburn and the neighbourhood this year 747 were able-bodied, last year only 249. In this case the burden thrown upon the rates was not quite doubled, but the number of able-bodied paupers was increased threefold. It is natural that the pressure should increase towards the end of the period of suspended wage-earning; and if we take the doubled burden as representing the average for the nine weeks of the strike throughout the whole district affected, we shall probably be not far from the truth. But the increased poor's rate is one element only of the case. The funds of the various organizations which benefit industrial life have been probably almost entirely absorbed, and show now a blank or a deficit to meet the claims arising in the case of old age, sickness, accident, or death. Then, again, we have to add to the reckoning the heavy losses which, simply by the stoppage of their usual sources of revenue, must have fallen on the capitalists. The fact of capital remaining without usufruct, the fixed charges which must run on with hardly diminished pressure, whether the mill works or stops, and the voluntary contributions made by many of the employers to relieve from starvation the very hands who were refusing to work their mills, will together mount up to a formidable total of sacrifice, the ultimate damage of which must fall upon all the branches of industry which the capital so absorbed or neutralized should feed. Nor are the expenses incident to the military occupation of several

towns, owing to the riots, to be left out of the account. The operatives, indeed, have suffered a first time in the losses which the absence of wages have inflicted on themselves, a second time in that which the loss of profit has caused to their employers, a third time in the wanton havoc of mills demolished, valuable machinery spoilt, private houses fired, and a vast variety of the elements of wealth thus subducted from the resources of the district. One indirect benefit, indeed, may be ascribed to mob-violence in this case, viz., that by alienating the sympathies of the community from the operatives, it cut off many sources of supply to their funds, and thus shortened a struggle which might otherwise have been protracted with greater suffering, though with no hope of a different issue. But there is another and wider class of sufferers less frequently thought of, the trading community, who are all the more worthy of sympathy as being neutrals in the strife, and, on whichever side the fault may lie, absolutely exempt from all complicity with its agents, or responsibility for its existence. The strike forces them into the unhappy position of being forced to give credit but unable to obtain it. The wholesale dealer is remote from local sympathies, declines to enter into the merits or hardships of the case, abides by the rules of commerce, has his own bills to meet, and cannot spin three months into six, and when the retailer pleads trade losses in the strike, merely bids him 'look to his bond.' The latter may choose between letting his customer run into his books, or letting the society on which he depends for his subsistence be broken up for want of ways and means to hold on. Thus the unhappy tradesman is in a double forceps, that which is pressed upon him by the merchant on the one hand, and that which is plied by the customer on the other. It has been estimated that 200,000 persons were deprived of their ordinary resources of subsistence by the strike, and that 75,000*l.* per week, or 675,000*l.* in the nine weeks, was forfeited in wages. This we take, however, to be an over-estimate, and should put it at a total of about 500,000*l.* for the nine weeks, or something under 60,000*l.* weekly. The withdrawal of this large amount of circulating medium usually spread in the form of wages over the surface of society cripples and prostrates the energies of the shopkeeper. Empty tills, bad debts, embarrassment, insolvency, paralyze the resources of trade and will probably be felt in various degrees of strain and exhaustion, even if that revival of the cotton trade should come to pass which hardly the most sanguine seems to regard as likely for some time to come.

On the general theory of strikes we may here venture to quote the authority of Professor Jevons, of Owen's College, Manchester, who says:—

‘I have not the least doubt that strikes, on the whole, produce a dead loss of wages to those who strike, and to many others. I believe that if there had not been a strike during the last thirty years, wages would now be higher in general than they are, and an immense amount of loss and privation would also have been saved. It has in fact been shown by Dr. John Watts, of Manchester, in his *Catechism of Wages and Capital*, that even a successful strike usually occasions loss. He has said: “Allowing for accidental stoppages, there will not be in the most regular trades above fifty working weeks in the year. If a strike for a 4 per cent. rise of wages succeeds in a fortnight, it will take twelve months’ work at this improved rate to make up for the lost fortnight; and if a strike for 8 per cent. lasts four weeks, the workman will be none the richer at the end of twelve months; so that it frequently happens that even when a strike succeeds, another revision of wages takes place before the loss is made up; a successful strike is therefore, like a successful law-suit, only less ruinous than an unsuccessful one.” If we remember that a large proportion of strikes are unsuccessful, in which case of course there is a simple loss to every one concerned; that when successful, the rise of wages might probably have been gradually obtained without a strike; that the loss by strikes is not restricted to a simple loss of wages, but that there is also a loss to the employer’s business and capital, which is sure to injure the men also in the end; it is impossible to doubt that the net result of strikes is a dead loss. The conclusion to which I come is, that, as a general rule, to strike is “an act of folly”—*Science Primers, Political Economy*, pp. 66-7.

The fact is, when trade is brisk, the demand for labour increases, employers bid against each other to secure hands, and the price of labour must go up. When trade stagnates, that demand slackens, fewer hands find employment, and the price of labour must fall. The combination of any number of thousands of men can no more resist this law than they can prevent the action of gravitation. But they *can* throw a whole branch of trade, perhaps with many kindred branches, into confusion, they *can* alarm the capitalist, perhaps scare him away, they *can* make the consumer feel insecure of his supply, they *can* drive away profitable business and carry custom to the rival shop. The same thing is of course true, *mutatis mutandis*, of a ‘lock-out.’ This axiom holds at all times; but the cotton operatives selected a specially inopportune time for striking—in short, one when success was on the face of things impossible.

Before reviewing, however, the general aspect of the trade in proof of this, let us see what the men had to say for them-

selves. They urge that there was no plethora of labour in the cotton districts of Lancashire, in fact a short supply, barely enough to fill existing mills. Therefore the incline of the market was naturally in their favour at the time reduction was proposed. They urge that the employers had never taken them into partnership, nor offered them in palmy times a dividend of profits: why then now seek to make them share the losses of capital when times were bad? They had never received more than the market price of labour, why should they now take less?

These are cogent arguments for ordinary circumstances. But we shall further show that the circumstances were far from ordinary, and that in April last the cotton trade was, through a long period of accumulated losses—not to put too fine a point upon it—nearly on its last legs. There was, speaking generally, no fund from which to pay wages. That is to say, the firms which still paid dividends did not more than make up the losses of those who paid none; taken all round, therefore, there was no margin, and relief or collapse were, we believe, the manufacturer's alternatives.¹ When this is so, to close the mills, an act which at once causes a dearth of employment, becomes, under the conditions of the case, the only natural resource. It would ordinarily be condemnable as an artificial stimulus to dearth, but, given the above alternatives, the objection ceases to be valid. So, conversely, if wages drop below the subsistence point, the men may reasonably decline the labour, and seek employment in a remunerative field. They appear to have so fallen in America. The fall is variously estimated at from 25 to 40 per cent., certainly a good deal below what the men in Lancashire were refusing. Nay, before the last American reductions, business, it is believed, had for some time been going on at a wage-rate below that proposed by the Lancashire manufacturers. At any rate, re-migration from Boston and New York to Liverpool was reported among the cotton hands, at the time when the Lancashire strike was imminent. Thus the employers here were fairly entitled to try the question, whether labour would be forthcoming at a rate which they thought might save them from ruin.

But the men further urge that in Lancashire weekly wages had been unaltered in their rates since 1853. They say, however, nothing about the number of hours worked per week, which, we believe, has, by the Factory Acts passed since

¹ See *Cotton*, April 20, 1878, p. 239, 'The Spectator on 'Change.'

1853, been reduced considerably; while they admit that the amount of weekly earnings has by speedier machinery (introduced, of course, at the employers' expense), by the adoption of piece-work, and by improved economy of industry, greatly increased. In illustration of this we append two tables of wages taken from *The Practical Manufacturer* for May 1878, p. 11.

'At the earlier period in our district the wages earned were as follows:—Lapfeeders, 11s. per week; jobbers, 10s. 6d.; roving tenters, 8s. 3d.; minders, 18s.; whereas the same classes of operatives were in March last earning, respectively, per week 22s., 23s. 9d., 18s., and 36s. 6d.

'The manager of a mill in another district gives the following as the percentages of increase during the same period in wages earned:—Lapfeeders, 90 per cent.; grinders, 100; drawing-frame workers and other frame-workers, from 70 to 90; self-actor minders, from 25 to 40; rulers and makers-up, 50.' Taking the two lists together, an increase of over 90 per cent. on the average is the result. Against this has to be set, of course, the rise in the price of most of the necessities of life. In illustration, however, of the habits of the operatives, we notice a statement that in one of the Lancashire towns affected by the late strike fresh butter speedily became a drug in the market, falling from 1s. 7d. to 1s. 2d. per lb.

Let us now briefly review the position of the Cotton manufacture as a whole. Its accredited trade returns¹ show that the annual value of cotton goods produced in Great Britain, which had steadily increased by due gradations from 86 millions of money in 1869, up to 104½ millions in 1873, since that year has regularly declined, being represented approximately by 100½ millions, 95½, 89, and 85½ millions respectively in successive years till 1877 inclusive. We may assume that not less capital was invested in 1877 than in 1873. Probably more was invested; but assuming it no less merely, we here register a steady and gradual decrease of productiveness, reaching, at last, about 18½ per cent. of the previous total produced. It may safely be said that there has been no such change either in the value of cotton or in the value of money within those years, as will account for more than a very small fraction of this. This, then, is the first grave count in the reckoning: capital which had produced in 1873 100l. worth of value, yielded only 81½l. worth in 1877.

Again, take the total value exported. The same tables

¹ Ellison and Co.'s *Annual Review of the Cotton Trade* for 1877, p. 8.

show for 1872, the maximum year, a little over 80 millions. Then the totals decline successively, as $77\frac{1}{2}$, $74\frac{1}{2}$, $71\frac{1}{2}$, $67\frac{1}{2}$, $69\frac{1}{2}$ millions respectively, the last only being a slight recovery. This estimate confirms the former sufficiently nearly. British looms and spindles, which yielded for exportation over 80 millions of value in 1872, had sunk to less than 70 millions in 1877—a diminution of about 13 per cent.

Again, take the total value of home consumption. In 1872 it was over 48 millions, in 1877 it was slightly over $32\frac{1}{2}$, a decrease of about $32\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Take the total value of stock on hand at the close of the year. In 1873 it was over $9\frac{3}{4}$ millions, in 1877 it was under 6 millions, a decrease of about $38\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Take the weekly averages of cotton bales delivered in this country. In 1874 this was just under 62 million bales; in 1877 it had sunk to just over $56\frac{1}{2}$ million bales, a falling off of about 9 per cent. Thus the figures approximately confirm one another all round. We consumed less raw material, we produced a greatly less total value, we exported less, and we supplied vastly less for home consumption, and yet we had a still lighter balance of stock on hand at the close of the year. We need look no further to convince us that the capitalist had been going down hill for five or six years together at the close of 1877.¹

But the trade returns show still more conclusive evidence of depression in 1877. The *Oldham Chronicle* contains a compiled table showing the actual dividends declared by about 40 Companies' mills in its own neighbourhood. Of these 40 only four declared any dividend at all in the last two quarters of 1877, and the average dividend for the whole number was in that year $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. against 11 per cent. in 1876. Thirteen Companies, or all but *one-third of the whole number, declared no dividend whatever* throughout the year. They return zero in every one of its four quarters successively. And who knows what further loss this zero covers? We merely have the fact of *nil* as profit; how often under this *nil* there lurks a minus quantity, there is no index to show. Companies do not proclaim their losses; the return of *nil* profit covers, as with a modest veil, the gulf of deficiency, the depth of which we suspect, but cannot probe. As a last index of the depression manifested in 1877, we adduce the fact that, out of those forty mill-firms only four in its last two

¹ 'The year 1871 was no doubt a very profitable year for the cotton trade, but 1874 was only moderately profitable; 1877 was therefore very bad, while 1878 was simply disastrous.'—*Cotton*, April 20th, 1878, p. 238: 'The Profit and Loss Account of the Cotton Trade.'

quarters declared any dividend at all. It is added, 'As the Oldham mills are understood, for the most part, at least, to possess the latest improvements in machinery, and to be worked upon the most economical principles, the above list may be taken as representing the entire cotton industry of the country.'¹

With one more example of the way in which prices were working for the capitalist, we conclude this review of his position. The margin between the average price of 1lb. of raw cotton (what are called 'uplands' in the trade is regarded as the standard sample) and the average price of 1lb. of twist or of cloth, is taken as an index of the remunerative effect of prices on the producer. Taking 'twist' and 'cloth' together, that margin was in 1877 lower by $\frac{1}{3}\frac{1}{2}$ d., or nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ d., than it had been in 1876. (*Ibid.* p. 1.) The fraction looks insignificant, but it is really nearly 7 per cent. of the whole margin in question, and its disappearance drove down dividends to zero or to absolute loss, perhaps to an exhausting deficiency, inconsistent, if continued, with solvency.

But yet once more, this ill-omened year closed with a still darker financial gloom. The margin to which we have referred as reduced by $\frac{1}{3}$ d. on the average of the twelve months, sank in December last $\frac{1}{3}$ d. lower yet. Such was the starting point for the new year's hopes. We have seen $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. was the average dividend of the year; how much of this would be left when this fall of $\frac{1}{3}$ d. below the miserable average of the year's margin had taken place? Profits, fast disappearing, must evidently have vanished altogether. No wonder, surely, that the mill-owners began to bethink themselves of that retrenchment which ought to have occurred to them long ago. But with stock and plant once set up, expenses are fixed and irreducible. Cost of material is beyond their control. Economical processes wait upon invention and follow not the exigencies of trade. Wages were the only department in which a reduction was possible. They gave due notice of the reduction of 10 per cent., and while the notice was running the price fell still lower and lower still—even 'in the lowest deep a lower deep' revealed itself, and the cotton interest seemed likely to land in a bottomless pit of embarrassment.

In short, it had now been so long let go ever from bad to worse, that the men, or their secretaries, urged with a show of reason, that were they in April last to have accepted the

¹ Ellison and Co.'s *Annual Review*, p. 2.

reduction, it could not have improved the masters' position, since the pressure to secure business must have transferred the ten per cent. at once to the buyer of goods. This, if a true, was but a short-sighted argument; for the moment the tide of decline began to turn, the advantage to the manufacturer must begin to be felt, and would clearly be felt sooner than it would have been if the reduction had not been made.

In order to make this plain, let us review the constituents in the price of a piece of 'shirtings,' such as forms the major part of Lancashire products. A piece weighing $8\frac{1}{2}$ lb., and measuring $38\frac{1}{2}$ yards, was selling at the end of May at 7s. 3d.

For this would be required 8lb. of cotton	s.	d.
at 6d. per lb.	=	4 0
The spinning wages for the same would	=	0 7 $\frac{1}{2}$
The weaver's " " " "	=	0 11
Leaving for interest on capital, wear and tear of machinery, management, inci- dental materials consumed, rent of land and buildings, including profit		1 8 $\frac{1}{2}$
		<hr/> 7s. 3d.

Now, 10 per cent. off each of the wages items would reduce the cost to about 7s. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Let us assume that the continued fall of the market would enable the buyer to secure the difference for the moment, *i. e.* to buy the piece at 7s. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Still, the moment a favourable turn brought the price above 7s. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a benefit would begin to accrue to the seller; whereas otherwise none would have accrued till it rose above 7s. 3d. This is so plain, that it seems extraordinary that sharp calculators, as the secretaries of the Weavers' Association evidently are, should not have perceived it. The position was like that of a ship on her beam-ends in a squall. The top hamper is cut away. It drops overboard, but she rights the sooner.

In proof of the continuance of the decline in the price of cotton fabrics through the first four months of this present year, we may adduce the admission of the operatives themselves. The weavers' secretaries writing on May 1, estimate 10 per cent off wages as equal to a reduction of 1d. in 18 yards of stuff, and they add that the fall of price since January *already equalled four times that amount*, yet without causing any increase in demand. The same authorities estimated a dead loss weekly of 60*l.* (or over 3,000*l.* a year) on every 500 looms, to their proprietor. The further decline, however, was posterior to the notice of the reduction of wages. Still it made it obviously more imperative to act upon that

notice. In fact, the practical conclusion seems to be, that which we have above indicated, viz. that that notice ought to have been given some nine months sooner—perhaps even earlier still. Had it been so, most of the *nil* returns of dividend in the last half of 1877 would probably have been saved. At any rate the operatives had had the benefit of full wages for almost, if not quite, a year after the margin of profit (?) had ceased to be able to pay it. As a consequence of this ever growing deficiency, it was computed in the trade that the depreciation in value of mill property, taking the 'Limited Companies' only, was at the beginning of this year from 2,000,000*l.* to 3,000,000*l.* But these Companies are believed to contain not above a tenth of the whole cotton capital, which, if it has suffered in proportion, is thus about 25,000,000*l.* 'to the bad.'

This then, with prices ever going down, profits rapidly disappearing, the two leading continents of the world groaning under prolonged commercial depression, rivals underselling, sources of demand drying up, customers killed off or starved off by the havoc of war or famine, was the period fixed upon by the operatives of Lancashire to refuse work, at a necessary reduction, which had indeed been due long before. Not only was India unable to purchase wearing apparel in like proportion as heretofore, owing to several successive famines, which same cause had also to a great extent stopped the demand of China, but war had deranged the markets of the Levant and of Russia. The American cotton manufacture, protected by the 'Morrill tariff' which ensured it the larger proportion of the home-market, was developing a competition, the result of which has been variously estimated, but which, owing to the reckless spirit of American trade, selling at a loss to get a footing in the market, rather than not sell at all, probably forms a serious count in the influences which disturbed Lancashire.

Bombay, moreover, has since 1860 taken extensively to cotton manufactures in the coarser sorts, such as suit the simple necessities of the great bulk of the native Indians. The following table shows the gradual development of this industry there:—

	Spindles at work.	Consumption of Bales per week.
1861	338,000	1,250
1874	593,000	2,190
1875	886,000	3,270
1876	1,124,000	4,150
1877	1,231,000	4,560

* The trade review¹ which contains it adds, 'Most unquestionably the bulk of the out-turn has gone to supply wants that would otherwise have been met by imports from Great Britain.' We should add that all this while a protective tariff has fostered this manufacture in Bombay, by levying a duty of nominally 5 per cent. on cotton goods imported into India, but believed to be equal to 8 per cent. on Manchester prices. On March 19, however, in this year, the Indian Government announced the abolition of this duty on all coarse and heavy makes, *i. e.* virtually on all which the looms of Bombay are engaged in turning out. Thus in the future the Bombay and the Lancashire producer will stand on the same level, save in so far as distance from the Eastern market adds freight to the expenses of the latter. Whether the Bombay mills will be able to maintain themselves when this protection is withdrawn, is a question which time only can solve.

In America the import duty levied on cotton is believed to range from 35 to 75 per cent. It is stated that in spite of this sixty-one million yards of cotton fabric were sold in the American markets by this country in 1877. The factories in the United States are often grand in structure and design, but have been built, it is believed, by a lavish outlay of capital, which would disable them from effective competition outside the States themselves, were it not for the readiness of their managers to engage in a race along the road to ruin, of course in the hopes of turning the dangerous corner in time, and striking into a career of success. Thus, the necessity of realizing, and a determination to force sales with this object, has still further gorged an already glutted market, and even after nine weeks' stoppage of production in Lancashire, prices show no sign of rallying.

The efficacy of American competition has been impeached by the workmen's advocates. They say, 'England need not fear countries walled in by a protective tariff. Trades built up under such a system are incapable of a highly competitive power.' They illustrate by some American samples of excellent quality sent over in 1875, priced at 1s. 3½d. to 1s. 4½d. per lb., adding that Lancashire could produce as good at 1s. 1d. per lb. When these had been shuttlecocked about a good deal in the Manchester market, a shipping house is said at last to have introduced the bulks to which they belonged, 'without limit as to price,' and the author of the statement is confident that none of them reached 1s. 1d. per lb. Similarly

¹ Ellison and Co.'s *Annual Review*, p. 4.

they urge as regards finer goods, that some bleached shirting from America was offered at 6½*d.* per yard, and that a Manchester salesman at once undertook to supply a sample to match it at 4½*d.* per yard.

In reply to these and similar statements, a letter appeared in *The Times*, in which the writer said :—

‘I am myself engaged in buying these American calicoes from the importers, with whom I am in constant and intimate intercourse, and if your correspondents (Messrs. Whalley and Birtwhistle, the weavers’ secretaries) mean to say that these goods are always imported at a loss to American merchants and manufacturers, or that the trade is carried on under more unfavourable conditions than is our own export trade, I can only say that my experience does not confirm that view of the question. I can assure you that the rate of wages now paid for weaving at Fall River or Rhode Island, taking into account the reduction submitted to this month (May) without a strike, is fully 25 per cent. less than that paid in Lancashire. The question to be answered is, have the 30,000 pieces per week which have on an average been shipped from New York and Boston to this country during the last two or three years resulted in a loss . . . ? and if they have, has the loss been greater than that with which our own export trade has been carried on. My own impression is, that your correspondents are greatly deceiving themselves. But perhaps they know more than I do.’

Let us here just pause to estimate the rival exports of Great Britain and America, crossing each other on the Atlantic. It was said above on behalf of the operatives’ view that, in spite of the heavy duties levied by the United States, sixty-one million yards were exported by us thither in 1877. The estimate in the above letter of ‘30,000 pieces per week’ imported by us from thence *per contra*, if those pieces were of the dimensions given above, 38½ yards each, would amount to over 60,000,000 yards. Thus the rival exports on this computation closely balance each other. It should be noticed that it is the operatives who slight the efficacy of American competition; the mill-owners take a very different view, and are convinced of its formidable character. Which is most likely to be right?

Rejecting, however, the masters’ proposal, the operatives had suggestions of their own, the principal one being to combine the proposed reduction with ‘short time.’ They said, ‘Run the mills four days a week with 10 per cent. off wages, or five days with 5 per cent. off, or full time with present rates.’ The resource of working short time is already by experience familiar to Lancashire, and the fact that it is regarded as a reasonable expedient seems to argue an unsoundness in the

management of this great staple of British industry. It should here be added, that one view of the employers' policy is as follows :—Wishing to secure such a diminution of supply as short time would involve, but finding it impossible to bring many members of their body, owing to diverging interests, to accept the experiment of stopping the mills, they are believed by some to have stuck uncompromisingly to the proposed 10 per cent. reduction, as knowing that the men would reject it and refuse labour, when the mill must stop perforce, and their supposed object would thus be gained. It is impossible to say how far this backhanded policy has really influenced their views. Be that as it may, for nine weeks the life-pulses of the Lancashire cotton trade stood still, thereby procuring in the lump a cessation, which, if distributed at the rate of two days in each week, would have lasted over more than half a year. Yet at the end of the dead-lock no appreciable relief to the overloaded market was found.

As regards the policy of the masters, Mr. J. C. Fielden, on the relief committee in Manchester in aid of the locked-out workmen, wrote and published a letter not long ago, in which, speaking of 'short time,' he says, 'for two years the masters have been trying in every possible way to bring it about. Attempt after attempt has been made to get up meetings of the trade 'to adopt short time.' He quotes several published letters in proof of it, and says 'he could fill a dozen newspapers with such extracts.' Thus it seems likely enough that the enforced cessation for nine weeks, although the employers' policy may not have directly designed it, yet chimed in with their immediate interests. They knew that the operatives were unlikely to be able to hold out very long, and two or three months of closed mills would suit them at any rate better than the perpetual game of opening and shutting for four and two days alternately, like a revolving lighthouse, kept up perhaps for a year together. Thus they would get what they thought a double benefit, the 10 per cent. reduction when the men came in, and the respite from production while the men stopped out.

It is perhaps noteworthy, that the productive energies of the Lancashire loom are so overwhelming that they require to be tempered with these fits of idleness, for fear the world should be choked with twist and shirtings; just like an over-active sheep-dog, whose attentions to the sheep are so pressing that he absolutely requires one of his legs to be tied up. But the remedy seems an economical enormity. Imagine a man who might work the week out for 18s. insisting on

working four days only and on receiving 14s. ! It has a curious look about it. But conceive a hundred thousand workpeople in the very vortex of the world's competition, beset by rivals east and west, fighting protective tariffs, from Bombay to Fall River, coolly proposing to spend a third of their working time for an indefinite period in idleness ! The proposal outrages all the more sober decencies of sophistry. The fallacies of the most bigoted protectionist seem common sense when compared to this. As well determine that one yard of cotton in every three turned out from the loom shall be burnt as soon as made. Unhappily, men, acting in masses, by the hundred thousand, are proof against ridicule ; as well try to tickle a Leviathan ; and Lancashire operatives afford no exception to this rule. Besides which they make another serious mistake. Their proposal to close the mills for two days out of six assumes that the Masters' Association is a body drilled and organized to move at the word of command, like their own Trades' Union. Whereas individual mill-owners cannot be made to surrender their independence in this way, for the simple reason that they have no such bond of union as that simple primary passion for high wages and short hours which acts spontaneously on any number of myriads of workmen. Therefore they cannot be set, like a clock, to go slow or fast, 'short time or long,' at pleasure. Of course they have common interests and take common counsel ; but rules which might be profitable, or tolerable to some, would be damaging and intolerable to others. They have no subscriptions to a common fund to ensure against trade losses—a fact which is the *primum mobile* of a trades union. This sufficiently establishes a fundamental difference. Thus the men's proposal was inapplicable to the case.

A good deal of odium was incurred by the employers for declining arbitration. But who was to arbitrate ? Some would think, the Bishop of Manchester and Mr. Gladstone for masters and men respectively. No doubt they would have found time for it, and might have been empowered to refer to the Czar of Russia or the President of the United States as umpire. But, more seriously, how was any arbitrator's decision to be enforced ? Without provision for enforcement the decision is nugatory and the arbitrator ridiculous. On the other hand, if it is to be compulsory, a vital blow is struck at the freedom of trade. Conceive a mill-firm, bleeding to death by heavy and prolonged losses, compelled to continue those losses and go on to bankruptcy ; or a hundred thousand workmen obliged to go on for six months, or a year, or indefi-

nately until trade revives, at unremunerative wages. This seems implied in a decision which is to be compulsory on those who seek it. It would really be an attempt to return to the old-world notion of fixing prices by law. Once begun, why not extend it to other commodities besides labour? If the price of labour may be so fixed, why not that of corn, coal, tobacco, and so forth? But the facts above adduced show that the employers could only bind themselves to accept arbitration at the cost of possible ruin. Many months of ever further falling prices had taught them the necessity of pulling in somewhere, if they hoped to pay their way. A man who finds he cannot pay his coachman, groom, and gardener, is forced to retrench his establishment. What need of an arbitrator to tell him he must? What use of an arbitrator to tell him anything else? On the other hand, if a mere conciliator was wanted to explain misunderstandings and soothe angry friction of colliding interests, there was Alderman Pickop. How he fared in his benevolent project we shall see further on. That his offer should have been rejected by tens of thousands to hundreds, and that the same men who so rejected it should have surrendered, a few weeks later, to the employers' original demand, cannot tend to raise our opinion of the Lancashire operatives' discretion.

Of course, if the principle of 'short time' were sound, it would be as good for iron, pottery, upholstery, boots and shoes, as for cotton. Suppose all dealers or handicraftsmen in these various useful products made the same assumption, that commodities were to be forced to, or kept at a given price by enhancing the cost of production or distribution. Imagine the grocers putting up their shutters on Thursday night to maintain the price of sugar! For this is what it comes to. It is the weekly subsistence of the workmen which forms the real wages, not the weekly shillings, more or fewer. These men want the product of their labour to bring in a six days' subsistence, whilst its real cost is only four days' subsistence. If this were done all round, who could live? Conceive a fifty per cent. added to the cost of all the necessities of life! Everybody would be pinched to utter penury that lives by industry. 'Cleanness of teeth' would be in every dwelling. None would feel the pinch more keenly than the workmen themselves. When, therefore, we find these intercalations of idleness commonly recurring in cycles of industry, as we fear the history of the cotton trade will show has been the case, we are led irresistibly to the conclusion that there must be something wrong in the method of it, and we believe it to be

this. Lancashire has such a highly accomplished organization of industry that nothing is so easy as to go on to-morrow doing exactly as was done to-day. The groove is so smooth and the piston works so true, that the numerical results of the machine accumulate faster than the world can absorb them. More jaconets, more shirtings, more twists, follow those of yesterday, and 'the cry is, still they come.' It does not seem to have occurred to Lancashire that it is possible for the world to be too full of these useful products. Thus supply is for ever outrunning demand. Great Britain and the United States are like two mountebanks at a fair, trying each which can pull the yards of tape out his mouth the fastest. Both sides of the Atlantic, to say nothing of many countries of Europe, notably France, have now engaged in the race to see who shall swathe us most deeply in calico. We thought we had the ball to ourselves, but it proves a round game.

Is it not better to direct energy and capital into newer channels than to go on clogging the old ones *ad nauseam*? Why not busy the brain to try what can be done in the way of novelties, instead of only busying the machine and the fingers to bring out more and more of the thing a thousand times staled? Try the merits of other fibres, new processes, more imaginative and artistic patterns. Bombay can, with her unlimited command of cheap Indian labour, probably match and undersell you in the coarse cloths she needs. She can command labourers who work fourteen hours a day and seven days in the week for those fabrics. Let her weave and wear them. But let Lancashire, with the lead of the world, and the pick of its markets, trust not to the dull momentum of routine, but to the living energy of invention, to retain and extend the command of the industrial field.

To resume the history of the struggle. When it was about midway through, Mr. Alderman Pickop, of Blackburn, came forward with a proposal, the gist of which was, that the men should accept the proposed reduction for three months, with a revision of the terms at the end of that period, or earlier, if both parties agreed. He urged the fact that to his knowledge 'many employers would,' owing to the bad state of trade, 'rather keep their mills closed, even with the reduction, than run them.' The Earl of Shaftesbury and Mr. Mundella, M.P., telegraphed to the weavers' secretaries, urging upon them the acceptance of this suggestion. For a brief time great hopes were entertained of the result, as Mr. Pickop was believed to enjoy as well as to have deserved the confidence of both parties. It was resolved to settle the question by a ballot of the operatives

taken in all the leading seats of their labour. At Padiham, and possibly elsewhere, they refused even to put it to the vote. In eight Lancashire towns, however, the ballot was taken with the result of nearly 14,000 votes against and less than 900 for it. This was on May 23rd. A week later the Mayor of Burnley ventured the suggestion of a reduction of 5 per cent. only for three months, and then, if trade showed no improvement, a further 5 per cent. reduction. Representative meetings of the men at Blackburn and Accrington are said to have approved of this, but the associated masters declined even to meet to consider it.

The main features of the riots, which drew upon not a few Lancashire towns a term of military occupation, unknown for more than a generation previously, are too notorious to require detailed notice. They included almost every variety of outrage on person and property short of actually deadly violence. Mills and private houses were burned or wrecked, their machinery and furniture destroyed, pictures, plate, &c., demolished or plundered. Windows were smashed wholesale, the roadways in several towns were still lying thick with brickbats and broken glass while the police investigations were going on. A dozen constables in Darwen alone were badly hurt, chiefly by stones, about the head. Personal assaults with hooting, pelting, &c., were made in broad daylight upon Alderman E. Birley and other millowners. Mr. Hornby was badly hurt in defending his own house, after offering 100*l.* ransom to the mob who assailed it. Col. R. R. Jackson had the narrowest escape of his life, while his wife and children, chiefly by the address of the coachman who cut his way through the mob, were able to make off, taking nothing with them but 'the clothes in which they stood.' His servants, meanwhile, the house being fired by night, ran some risk of perishing in the flames. 'To h— with the servants,' exclaimed the mob leader, a spinner from Blackburn, in reply to the remonstrance of some one in their favour, 'let the — burn!' Gangs of intimidators went round levying 'black-mail' on the publicans, and, finding it productive, extended their researches to outlying country houses, refusing food and demanding money. The hardest fate was that of a publican nearly blinded by a corrosive fluid thrown at his face deliberately, after much swagger and menace, by one of a party who had been already treated with beer gratis. The fluid had been previously levied without payment from a chemist.

There were conspicuous instances, too, in which the magistrates and civic authorities were not examples of vigilance and

promptitude. They omitted at Blackburn to stay the mischief in the nascent stage in which it is most easily checked. At another town the Mayor is said to have refused to read the Riot Act, although the conduct of the rioters clearly called for it. Two of the ringleaders of a violent mob at Darwen, which went about armed with bludgeons, pokers, hatchets, and other deadly weapons, and attacked the police, were caught, each man poker in hand, and dismissed, merely bound over to keep the peace, although several policemen had been badly injured. On the other hand, every pacific and persuasive influence was exhausted. This, of course, in principle, was right, but when it comes to an armed mob terrorizing the streets, *frappez fort et frappez vite* is the only practical rule of proceeding. The leaders of the mob in one of these parleys actually demanded that the police should be kept in their quarters, while they themselves were swaggering as it listed them through the town. And this proposal, we gather from published statements, was actually debated by the magistrates! The fact was, that after forty years of almost or wholly unbroken tranquillity, civil authority was taken at a disadvantage, and its representatives were unprepared. The soldiers charged, patrolled, and scoured the streets in several instances, but we have met with no recorded case of the actual use of their weapons. The police force seems to have behaved admirably. They were armed, at least in some cases, with cutlasses; but, though often suffering severely, used only their truncheons. Intrepid discharge of duty characterized their leaders. The Chief Constable of Lancashire, the Hon. Captain Legge, and his deputy, Captain Moorsom, were both badly hurt, one in the hand, the other near the eye. Several of the Inspectors or other chief officers of the police also figured amongst the casualties.

It had been hoped by all who valued the Lancashire operatives' character, that these outrages were not their work. That there ever floats about large centres of industry a considerable scum of idleness is undoubted. And many recruits to the mob may have been gathered from such sources. But when we look at the lists of prisoners arraigned for the various acts of violence, the illusion, we fear, is dissipated. That the police should in most cases have seized the wrong culprit, broken the wrong head, or sworn to the wrong individual, that the local papers, whose reporting staff and contributors live mostly on the spot, should have *misdescribed* the *émeute* as being that of weavers, spinners, and other mill hands, when it was really that of external roughs and loafers, is incon-

ceivable. Thus we read, *Blackburn Standard*, May 11, 'A crowd of operatives assembled and the stoning became more serious, until the police were obliged to charge.' Again we learn, *ibid.* May 25, that a mill manager named Ingham was assaulted by a violent party, all those identified being weavers or spinners. The same issue contains a report of a publican assaulted, and drink extorted by violence, the assailants identified being weavers or spinners. The *Liverpool Courier*, of May 25, summarizing from other local papers, records a charge against three men, two being weavers, for sharing in the assault on Col. Jackson's house near Blackburn, and another against eight men, of whom four were mill-hands, for going armed with sticks and stoning the police at Preston.

There is, at the same time, no reason to doubt that a large number of the more steady and respectable operatives bore no hand in the lawless acts and were heartily ashamed of their riotous brethren. But, as was asked by a correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, 'why did' such 'not freely enrol themselves as special constables, and thus help to quell the incipient reign of terror?' It is true that the weavers' committee put forth a notice,—'Every factory-worker is strongly advised not to hoot, shout, or otherwise annoy or molest any employer or employers, or to do any damage to their property, or even to mix up in any crowd whatsoever,' threatening that any so acting should receive no support; and afterwards put forth a vehement denunciation of the violence used and repudiation of all sympathy with it. None knew better than the weavers' secretaries that the men had better have burnt and wrecked their own cottages and furniture, as regards the interests of the strike-fund, than their employers' mills and residences. We, therefore, quite believe the earnestness of these manifestoes, but the observation is forced on us, that there would have been little call for such utterances, had not mill-hands been known to be sharing in the proceedings so denounced. Again, a Manchester paper tells us, 'The extremely bitter spirit engendered by the strike is not the least deplorable feature of it,' and, after commenting on the course taken by the employers, adds, 'these things would hardly have provoked riot, incendiarism, and assaults on the employers and their families, if the relations between masters and work-people had previously been fairly satisfactory.' This 'bad feeling,' the writer believes, 'urged the badly disposed and the reckless among the operatives into crime, while it kept the more respectable from preventing disturbance until they were

startled by the excesses of the mobs,' and adds, 'that the exasperation of the most intelligent operatives was intense.'

Colonel Jackson, who from his copious experience and conspicuous sufferings, is entitled to express an opinion, while defending 'the general good character of the Blackburn operative,' 'reconciles' it 'with the bitter and revengeful hatred shown' against himself, through the incessant stimulus to ill-feeling applied by the delegates at the various public meetings, at which ejaculations, 'We'll shoot him! We'll hang him!' have 'followed the more exciting paragraphs of their speeches without reproof.' But then, who are the delegates? 'Operatives of the operatives' is the only answer. They are the concentrated essence of their class; *i.e.*, if Colonel Jackson is right, the concentrated essence of its bitter feeling. We ought to add that, inconsistent as it may seem, the strike funds of the operatives have been largely subsidized by the employers themselves. Blinded by mob-passion the former forgot even mercenary gratitude, and rifled the very mills and homesteads from which they were drawing relief.

The dominant question for all classes, during this critical period of the cotton industry, was, how could the whole interest be kept from going to pieces? And this could only be solved practically by the employers taking upon themselves the responsibility of maintaining it. For the moment they looked to the social bond alone, and let political economy go. If they could not maintain the industrial army tolerably unbroken, the question whether employers or operatives prevailed in the end would be a purely speculative one. Even if they won, their victory would be useless, unless they kept the workpeople from being scattered meanwhile. In order to maintain the connexion, they used that most sacred of retaining fees, help in the day of need. In the first place they were social beings with human feelings; they were financial strategists afterwards; and their object was to bind Lancashire together, and prove to the rest of England, as in the days of the Cotton Famine, that she had one heart.

We fear very much that there are signs, notwithstanding, that the cotton industry can hardly ever again be what it was. Indeed, a much wider field than cotton seems open to the same prognostic. The spirit of trade-unionism threatens ruin to all the production of the country. The British workman has learned to grudge his labour, and as he is sowing so he will surely reap. He insists on short time; so did the hare, and despised the 'competitive power' of the tortoise.

SHORT NOTICES.

A Visit to the Roman Catacombs. By the Rev. J. SPENCER NORTH-COTE, D.D., Canon of Birmingham. (London: Burns and Oates, 1877.)

The Catacombs of Rome, Historical and Descriptive, with a Chapter on the Symbolism of Early Christian Art. By the Author of *The Buried Cities of Campania*, &c. (London, Edinburgh, and New York: T. Nelson and Sons.)

THESE two manuals are both intended for the same purpose—to serve as a guide to the Roman Catacombs, and each is good in its way: the one is by a convert to Romanism, and is intended chiefly for the use of Roman Catholics, and the author has the advantage of being thoroughly well acquainted with his subject, only allowance must be made for the rose-coloured spectacles through which he views every object, and an evident and not unnatural wish to lead other people to follow his example. The other is in some respects the reverse; the author is a Protestant, and his book is very Protestant, and, unfortunately, he is *not* well acquainted with his subject. He appears to have compiled his book from other good authorities, without having ever been to Rome himself, if we may judge by his extraordinary and evidently unconscious blunders about localities.

We propose to give a concise account of each of these manuals, with a few extracts.

To begin with the Roman Catholic one, as on the whole the best, we are obliged to demur at the first page. *Roma Sotterranea* is a misleading title: it leads many an American or Englishman, who takes it in his head to see the celebrated Roman Catacombs, to expect to find them really under the city of Rome, and he is much surprised to find that they are generally two miles off, and some of them much more. The oft-quoted passage from S. Jerome has probably led to too many *pilgrimages* to the Catacombs, and seems to have been quoted for this object; these pilgrimages are not often very religious or reverential, and perhaps the modern Romans are not far wrong in saying that their main object is to bring money to the priests.

The woodcuts in this volume are very good and attractive, and convey the idea of the Catacombs extremely well, although they are not quite accurate. Dr. Northcote's attempt on p. 7 to show that the Catacombs have no connexion with the old sandpits, is going too far, from one extreme to the other; they are *not* sandpits, but they are almost all connected with an old sandpit road. When he says, to prove his point, that 'they happen *not* to be excavated either in sand or in stone, but precisely in a rock of intermediate consistency, too solid to be used as sand, too soft and friable to be used as

building stone,' he generalises too much from the one example that has been so admirably illustrated by the two brothers De Rossi; it is not by any means true of all; the material necessarily depends on the nature of the soil in which the *fossore*s had to make the graves; several of them are in clay, others in alluvial soil; besides *tufa* is a building stone, though soft, and not calculated to bear much weight. All the walls of Rome of the time of the Kings are built of *tufa*, although *tufa* sometimes may vary in quality, from the solid stone to mere sand. *Tufa* was originally volcanic dust, such as overwhelmed Pompeii, and Pozzolana sand is still *tufa*; it is commonly hardened by time and moisture, and some other circumstances, and varies greatly in colour also, but it is *tufa* still.

That 'the Roman Catacombs were made solely for the sake of burying the dead,' is absolutely true; but when Dr. Northcote goes to say, 'But by whom? and to bury what dead? we answer, and again without hesitation,—by Christians, and only to bury Christians,' he begs a question which is really a very doubtful one. Such is the modern Roman theory, supported by the high authority of De Rossi (if not first proposed by him); the old authorities do not say so, and the large number of Pagan inscriptions found in the Catacombs does not agree with this theory; and when he says that *all* these pagan inscriptions were taken down as old marble only, he again begs the question. A large proportion of them have no appearance of having been taken there for that purpose, but as an actual inscription to be put on the grave of the person buried there, often with the mortar adhering to it. The Christian inscriptions have nearly all been carried away to be put in museums and churches, but the pagan ones were left where they are found. The assertion (p. 49) that, 'as, in the beginning of the fifth century, they had ceased to be used as places of burial, so in the first half of the ninth, they ceased to be frequented for purposes of devotion,' is not borne out by the inscriptions. Though in the later period they are not common, they do not cease altogether; nor with the history of Anastasius, who records many *restorations* of them by the Popes in the eighth and ninth centuries. Dr. Northcote mentions, at page 50, the legend, as if it was gospel truth, that the bodies of SS. Peter and Paul had a temporary resting-place in the cemetery (or catacomb) of S. Sebastian *ad Catacumbas*; but he omits to mention that the Circus of Maxentius was also made *ad Catacumbas*, and that S. Sebastian's was long called *the Catacomb*, being probably the entrance to several, and this is the name of the valley under the hill, on which stands the tomb of Cæcilia Metella.

In inscriptions on tombstones, and in the *graffiti*, or scratchings on the plaster of the walls of the third century in Rome, the mixture of Greek and Latin words is very common; as may be seen in the guard chambers of the Palaces of the Cæsars on the Palatine, and in any collection of tombstones. The Greek *kata*, 'under,' and the Latin, *cumba*, 'the hill,' is therefore very likely to have been the name given to this valley, and to the cemeteries in this valley, and those the earliest, Prætextatus and S. Urban's, as well as S. Sebastian's; that name was applied to them, and soon became the general name for

them in Rome, and from Rome spread to other places. The name given to them by Anastasius is always *cœmeteria*. In Dr. Northcote's chapter on 'Their Paintings and Sculpture' he has ingeniously mixed together two things which are not necessarily connected. The sculpture on the Sarcophagi cannot be *restored*, but the paintings *may be*, and often were. About thirty Catacombs are recorded to have been restored by the Popes in the eighth and ninth centuries; and the things which were likely to be *restored* are the paintings, and this agrees with what we find, but which Dr. Northcote altogether ignores. Those who are at all acquainted with the history of art can see at a glance the difference between a painting of the seventh century and one of the third or fourth; and it is certain that *three-fourths* of the paintings are restorations of the later period, as Mr. Parker has shown by his photo-engravings; but those only excite the ire of Dr. Northcote, who cannot see that these are restorations, his *rose-coloured* spectacles will not allow him to see them. Then, in the sculpture also, it is well known to all who have studied the subject, that the *Christian* Sarcophagi are all of the fourth or fifth centuries; there are no *restorations* of them, but they do not 'belong to the first three centuries;' that some of the paintings on the vaults are of the second century is true, but they are not of Christian or religious subjects. The Vine on *the vault* of the great entrance chamber of Prætextatus *is* of the *second* century, but the Good Shepherd on *the wall* of the same chamber *was* of the fourth (it was destroyed in 1876). It is shown in Dr. Northcote's woodcut at p. 69, but too small to show the different styles of drawing. The Vine on the vault of the passage at one of the entrances to S. Domitilla, Nereus, and Achilleus is of the third century; the character of the drawing is *not* like the one in Prætextatus. The other figures of 'Daniel in the Lions' den,' 'Noe in the Ark,' &c., which Dr. Northcote assumes to be of *the same period*, because they are close at hand, are not earlier than the fourth, many of them later. 'The Good Shepherd' is not necessarily a Christian subject; the Christians adopted it from the heathens, but by far the greater number of them, and they are very numerous, are undoubtedly Christian, and some of them *may be* of the *third*. The style of drawing in the pretty woodcuts in Dr. Northcote's book is evidently that of the modern artist of the nineteenth century, who has drawn them on the wood. If compared with Mr. Parker's photographs and photo-engravings, the *different style* of art is very evident; in some cases they are not like the same picture. In one instance only Dr. Northcote acknowledges that the paintings are so rudely drawn, that 'probably they belong to the age of the translation of the relics, *i.e.* the ninth century.' He cannot see that the same remark applies to *many* others. With these slight blunders, which are what might be expected, this is a very good and useful guide to the Catacombs of Rome.

The other guide to the Catacombs is more ambitious than Dr. Northcote's, as will be seen by the title-page already given. It professes to be 'Historical and Descriptive,' and to explain the 'Symbolism of Early Christian Art.' The idea is a good one, and it is fairly

executed as far as can be done by a *compilation* from good authorities, without taking the trouble to go and see the Catacombs themselves, so as to understand them more thoroughly. The woodcuts in this volume are also fairly drawn, but from the inaccurate drawings of Perret, not from the photographs. The first chapter, 'Where the Catacombs are situated,' betrays the real ignorance of the author on the subject. He can see no difference between the drawing of the second century and that of the ninth, and although he intends 'to clear up the misrepresentations of the Romanists,' he adopts their statements as if they were gospel. He has hit upon the right explanation of the name catacomb, *ad Catacumbas* (p. 12), but he attributes it to the seventh century, whereas it was used in the third and fourth. He adopts De Rossi's *estimate* that 'the galleries of the Catacombs extended to 587 geographical miles,' which can be only a *guess*, there can be no real calculation. He says that 'the country about Rome consists *almost entirely* of volcanic rocks, of which the most ancient is a compact conglomerate, known as *lithoid tufa*, and still largely employed as building stone; while above it lie ejected ashes and scoriæ, mixed with a few currents of solid lava. Underneath the *lithoid tufa* we come to the *granular tufa*, and it is in this formation the Catacombs are mainly excavated. This stone is dry and porous, and therefore easily worked; and, being dry and porous, it rendered the galleries excavated in it *not unsuitable as retreats for the living*, a purpose to which they were often devoted.' This is altogether a misunderstanding of the description by De Rossi, and calculated entirely to mislead the student. To the single Catacomb of S. Calixtus, *which alone* De Rossi has described, it is practically true, but to many others it does not apply at all, and the *assumption* that they were *often devoted* as retreats for the living is not true. In the sharp but short persecution of the Christians under Julian the Apostate, the Bishops of Rome used to reside in the Monastery of S. Sebastian, or of S. Urban *ad Catacumbas*, and as there were subterranean passages from these into the Catacombs, and through the galleries of the Catacombs, with outlets known only to the Christian *fossors*, they might thus have escaped; but on one occasion the Pope was performing the service called THE MASS, in the small chapel at the entrance to the Catacomb of Prætextatus, and with the true martyr-spirit would not stop the service to escape, and was taken off to the place of *public execution*, where the Monastery of S. Sisto Vecchio now stands, and was beheaded there, having been legally condemned to death by the authorities.

The successive layers of tufa, collected in many ages, vary considerably in all sorts of ways, in thickness from a few inches to twenty or thirty feet, and in quality and colour; some of the layers are still volcanic dust or sand, others have been hardened into stone, harder or softer according to circumstances. It is also a great blunder or exaggeration, when our author says, 'the Christian community set to work to enlarge the Catacombs; they constructed them one below the other; sometimes as many as five rows or stages of galleries were superimposed in the same crypt; the uppermost would not be

more than twenty-five feet below the surface, the lowest would be nearly three hundred.' This is gross exaggeration; the usual height of the galleries did not exceed ten feet, and if we allow another ten feet of *tufa* between the galleries it is ample, as may be readily seen by the sloping steps going down from one to the other. Twenty feet for each gallery is therefore quite sufficient to allow, and this gives 120 feet for the six stages, instead of 300. We doubt whether any one was more than 100 feet deep. The whole of this chapter is full of ludicrous blunders: at p. 19 it is stated, '2. The Cemeteries of S. Praetextatus and S. Sebastian are situated under the Vatican Hill,' which is about three miles off, and on the other side of the Tiber. '5. Under the *Via Ostiensis*, those of SS. Felix and Adajecta or Commodilla, S. Cyriac, S. Timotheus, and S. Zeno.' Not one of these is on the road to Ostia, and they are not all on the same road; some are on the road to Ardea, others on that to Tibur or Tivoli. At p. 36 it is stated that after A.D. 312, when the 'Peace of the Church' was proclaimed by Constantine, 'subterranean interments fell gradually into disuse.' This is entirely a mistake; a large proportion of them are later, and it is doubtful whether there is a single painting of a religious or scriptural subject *before* that date, and not one painting of a saint not scriptural before the sixth, if so early. John I. in A.D. 523 made one catacomb or cemetery, according to Anastasius, and restored two others, and we have the same subjects and the same style of painting in all three, but we do not remember a single figure of a saint (not scriptural) of his time.

In describing 'the translation of the relics' of the martyrs, as they are called, he says that 2300 bodies were carried to the one Church of S. Prassede, and 'many cartloads of the relics of martyrs to the Pantheon;' we might add similar numbers were sent to some other churches also; and he very naturally observes that 'the dead in the Catacombs were not all martyrs, but Roman writers invariably indulge in this exaggeration,' which is very true. When he quotes Lord Lindsay, who says that '*Rome is undermined in every direction* by subterranean excavations,' he repeats what he ought to know is altogether false. The Catacombs are *two miles* from Rome, and many much farther off, as we have said. Lord Lindsay probably is aware of this *now*, though he was mistaken when he wrote.

Chapter IV. relates to the 'Early Christian Inscriptions,' which are genuine things, and there is a good superficial summary of information about these. The same may be said of Chapter V. 'On Christian Monographs and Symbols,' which are always interesting; and in Chapter VI. 'On Christian Art in the Catacombs.' The woodcuts are fairly engraved, but we could have wished that some of them had been from more accurate drawings; the celebrated 'Jewelled Cross' is an instance, the inaccurate drawing of Perret is strictly followed; the same objection applies to Chapter VII., on 'The Paintings in the Catacombs;' the drawings are so inaccurate that they can scarcely be recognised, and their character is that of the modern artist who has drawn them, not of the early period to which the Catacombs belong. Chapter VIII. and last, 'A Tour through

the Catacombs,' is not very satisfactory, but it is well intended, and we are loth to criticise it. Throughout he follows De Rossi and Dr. Northcote too blindly, and sees objects through their coloured spectacles. When he follows Mr. Marriott in saying that the Catacomb paintings in no way countenance the Romish *cultus* of the Virgin, he is quite right, but they are both mistaken in supposing that the Romish assumption that the female figure seated on the same throne with Christ, in the same mosaic in the Church of *S.M. in Trastevere*, is intended for the Blessed Virgin; the inscription which she holds in her hand from the Song of Solomon shows that the figure was intended for THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, 'the ever youthful Bride of Christ.' The Romanists, as usual, beg the whole question by their *false assumption*. Each of the figures bears a scroll with an inscription, one of which is a genuine text from the Vulgate version of the Song of Solomon, the other is *half genuine*, and the other half made up for the purpose in the thirteenth century, when the WORSHIP OF THE MADONNA, OR BLESSED VIRGIN, was fully established.

On the whole, this book may be recommended as containing much useful information in a portable and convenient form; but it is much to be regretted that the author did not go and see the Catacombs for himself before he wrote about them.

Since the foregoing notice was in type, we have received Dr. Spencer Northcote's new work, *Epitaphs of the Catacombs; or, Christian Inscriptions in Rome during the first four Centuries*. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1878.) We are happy to find that this is a work in which all true Catholics can agree, whether Greek Catholics, Roman Catholics, or Anglo-Catholics; and all English Catholics will be much obliged to Dr. Northcote for the very useful and popular abridgment of the great work of De Rossi that he has made. All Catholics agree in their admiration of the early Christian Martyrs, and in considering the contemporary inscriptions on their graves, or relating to them, as peculiarly interesting. Unfortunately, few English people read Italian, and yet all well-informed persons have long heard of the great work of De Rossi, and wish to know more about it. Some violent Protestants, indeed, have denied the authenticity of the inscriptions, but without any reason; even if some of them are plaster casts, as is said, and the original marble slabs are preserved in the Vatican for greater security, this does not make them less authentic, or less interesting. It will be observed that of the four bishops of Rome who were buried in the catacomb of S. Calixtus in the third century, two were Greek, and are inscribed as Episcopus or Bishop, and not Papa or Pope; it is well known that Papa is still the name of any priest in the Greek Church: he is the father of his flock; it was not till after the transfer of the seat of empire to Byzantium by Constantine, that the Bishop of Rome assumed that he was sole father of the whole Christian Church of Western Europe. This was probably, in fact, part of the system of the temporal power of the Roman Church, which is grounded entirely on the decretals of S. Gregory. Since the time of Baronius

they have been given up by the Romans themselves, though portions of them are still used in the public service of the Roman Church, extracts from the decretals being part of the Roman Breviary. Of course Dr. Northcote makes no reference to this, but he does honestly acknowledge that Papa was not originally an exclusive title of the Bishop of Rome. We should not have mentioned this, were it not that ignorant persons often accuse Anglo-Catholics of Romanism, whereas the most formidable enemies of Romanists are well-informed Anglo-Catholics, who know the History of the Church, especially such as happen to know by experience the difference between Roman theory and practice. The present work of Dr. Northcote's is written in a truly Christian spirit, and we will add a few extracts, to give some idea of its nature and plan :—

‘From the earliest ages, and in all stages of civilisation, men have sought to preserve their memories from decay by means of inscriptions, more particularly by inscriptions graven upon their tombs ; as though they would fain bid special defiance to the envious tooth of time, there where its bite seemed to be at once inevitable and fatal. . . .’

‘However, in spite of their brevity, they have often furnished important contributions to our stores of historical knowledge, and sometimes also in other branches of human science they have rendered valuable services. And, independently of these accidental uses which may occasionally be made of them, there is another and a more general interest which almost always attaches to them, if only they contain something more than a name and a date—the interest, namely, which belongs to the records of human thought and feeling under circumstances which are common to us all, viz. the thought of death, as anticipated by ourselves or already suffered by our friends and relatives ; the general view taken of life now that it is over ; the feelings of regret at the loss of friends ; the good qualities selected for commendation in the notice of the deceased, and the way in which the love or respect of the survivors is testified. We have, most of us, at some time or other of our lives, beguiled an idle hour by spelling out the monuments of some village churchyard with reference to these and similar particulars, and have rarely failed to derive amusement or instruction from the occupation. The same fruits may of course be gathered from the study of collections of monumental inscriptions, whether brought together in museums or copied into books ; and if the collection be sufficiently large, and tolerably homogeneous, they often teach us more of the inner life, give us a more lively picture of the temper and mode of thought which characterised the people to whom they belong, than the more elaborate productions of their poets, philosophers, or historians. . . .’

‘We have seen that the most striking point of contrast between the ancient Christian inscriptions and those of their Pagan contemporaries is, that the latter constantly set forth with accuracy the *status* of the person deceased, and therefore give his several names at least, if not his parentage also, and his titles ; whilst the former, evidently of set purpose, or at least from some instinct which had the power and uniformity of law, omitted all these things as wholly without value’

‘We have desired to confine ourselves to a study of the more simple and original epitaphs—those which owed their origin to the affection and piety of private individuals, and which only undesignedly throw any light upon the tone of thought and feeling prevalent in the community to which their writers belonged. The inscriptions of Pope Damasus were

public monuments set up by authority, and intended in *perpetuam rei memoriam*; the epitaphs with which we have been concerned were, like those in our own village churchyard, simple chronicles of the dead, each of which, if taken alone, is trifling enough, but when studied all together, accidentally make interesting and unlooked-for revelations

'Pagan epitaphs, as we have said, looked back upon the past, and regretted its loss; Christian epitaphs, by the very earliest symbol engraved upon them, spoke the language of hope. If a Pagan mourner dared to look forward at all, it was to utter a feeble wish that he might be allowed to enjoy, as it were, a cold and gloomy repetition, a faint echo or image, of the present life; the Christian prayed for a new and everlasting life in God'

Again, at the end of this volume, we have another interesting example of this admirable correspondence between the known facts of history and the phenomena presented by the monumental remains that have been preserved to us. He has just registered his last epitaph belonging to the year 589.

'And now,' he says, 'I seem to be gathering the last relics of the *res epigraphica* of Rome, which had been gradually dying, and, indeed, was almost dead, from about the middle of this (sixth) century. Now I have come to that point where there are no longer even scanty relics to be found; for from the year 589 to the year 600, which is the limit I have prescribed to myself, I can find no Roman epitaph bearing any certain note of its date.'

The numerous woodcuts in Dr. Northcote's book are very convenient and not badly done: they are for the most part reduced from De Rossi's work, and a large proportion of them are given in the works of Bosio and Aringhi; so that they have been known to those who have given attention to the subject for the last two hundred years. We may as well mention to our readers that photographs of them all are included in Mr. Parker's series of *Historical Photographs*, which can be seen in most of the public libraries. He has not only given the few that remain in the Catacombs, but the whole of those arranged by De Rossi himself on the walls of the Lateran Museum and of the Monastery of S. Paul, near Rome. These photographs only confirm the truth of these inscriptions; so that cavillers can no longer deny their authenticity. For the dates of them, which is an important part of the question, Dr. Northcote is obliged to acknowledge, in his chapter on the 'Chronology of the Inscriptions,' that they are very rare in the first four centuries, and that there is but one really dated example of the first century, two of the second, twenty-three or twenty-four of the third, five hundred (more or less) both of the fourth and of the fifth, and the remainder belong to the sixth.

This being the case, is it not probable that the paintings originally belonged to the same periods as the inscriptions, and that after they were all seriously damaged by the Goths and the Lombards during their seizures of Rome, these paintings were restored by the Popes when the Catacombs themselves were re-made or restored by the Popes, some in the sixth century and others in the eighth or ninth, when there was a grand restoration of scores of Churches and Cata-

VOL. VII.—NO. XIII.

Q

combs for the use of the pilgrims, especially in the time of Charlemagne (or Charles the Great, as Mr. Freeman would have us say), when it is known that pilgrimages to the Catacombs were very much the fashion, as they have been again in the nineteenth century, under Pius the IX. ?

Notes of my Life, by Archdeacon Denison, tell a good deal of what is interesting in the Church history of the last thirty years from the standpoint of one who has filled a prominent place in much that has happened. It is not very usual for men to challenge the judgment of the world upon their lives, whilst they are still acting and moving in it ; but the Archdeacon of Taunton is not an ordinary man, and as he writes freely of others, so we must venture to speak as freely of him. His enthusiastic temperament and warm sympathies have led him to take a leading and courageous part, and have secured for him the affection of a large number of friends, whilst his eager partisanship makes him speak in the strongest terms of all which he opposes. It is a pleasure to find, notwithstanding this, that his book is free from unkind personalities. It is illustrative of this characteristic of the man, that so soon as the suit of Ditcher v. Denison was concluded he is able to write :—‘ The day following I sent my servant with a note to Mr. Ditcher, at South Brent, to say that we should be thankful to resume our old friendly relations.’ The offer was accepted, and the old intimacy was renewed ; and when Mr. Ditcher died some years later, at the request of his widow, Archdeacon Denison preached his funeral sermon. Not less noticeable is the Archdeacon’s fearless and intrepid advocacy of whatever he felt to be right. In such cases, he must say all that is in his heart, and say it in the way which will most attract notice, and possibly most wound opponents. Moreover, there is substantially throughout his career great consistency of purpose ; to the cause he has once advocated he feels pledged for life, and with few exceptions he adheres to it.

But throughout the ‘ Notes ’ it is evident that Archdeacon Denison’s forte is criticism, not construction ; he is at home in pulling to pieces proposals which he dislikes ; he rarely seems to have thought it necessary to propose a substitute, and never originates a policy which will leave a lasting mark in the Church’s history. The habit of mind thus manifested is noticeable from the outset of his career. Thus of his tenure of the curacy of Cuddesden (1832–1838) he writes :—

‘ I found a parish of some 500 souls, church-going people, with Holy Communion from time to time, and a number of communicants relatively very large : with Sunday school held in the church, with hardly anything to be called a daily school, and with no school buildings : with a pretty old church, closed pews and open sittings ; and I left all these things much as I found them’—(p. 67).

At Broadwinsor, of which he was vicar from 1838 to 1845, he built house and stables, and a small church and schools ; but such work was evidently not to his mind, and he groans over the expense. When he was at East Brent he made harvest festivals popular in his

parish ; and his example has since been generally followed. With these exceptions, and that of the ordinary duties of his offices, the Archdeacon's work has been chiefly controversial. As chaplain to the then Bishop of Bath and Wells, he was reported to have brought the doctrine of the Real Presence into undue prominence. To explain his views he preached two sermons in Wells Cathedral, which led to his prosecution. After a long and anxious period of trial and suspense, the whole proceedings were summarily brought to an end upon a technical point, of which he wisely availed himself. Besides this his name was for many years prominent as an opponent of the Government education measures ; and ever since its revival he has taken a leading part in Convocation. To judge of what he did with respect to primary education, we must have the position of things clearly before us. In 1839 the first movement was made by Government to further the efforts of the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society to educate the people. The country was then indifferent to the subject, and as long as it continued so it was possible for the clergy to undertake the larger part of the responsibility. But this did not last long, for the nation soon began to feel the influence of the spread of education in Germany and elsewhere. The rapid progress of trade and manufactures raised numbers of uneducated men to great wealth, and created a feeling that it was within the reach of all to improve their social condition, and that they ought to be trained in childhood with a view to such a possibility. A further impetus was given to popular education by the exhibition of 1851, which showed that our commercial supremacy might be challenged, and that our future prosperity would depend largely upon the training given to our artisans. Whilst what happened subsequently in the political as well as in the commercial world deepened the conviction in most minds that the poorer classes must be educated. Events have shown that no efforts would have availed to hinder the natural results which flow from such a conviction. Happily, as we think, the nation was resolved that its labouring population should not remain in ignorance. It was possible for the Church to guide this movement ; impossible for it to arrest it. To do the former great pecuniary sacrifices were needed, as education is a costly work ; the clergy alone could not undertake the responsibility. To help them to bear the burden, and to interest those who must find a large part of the funds, Government required that certain management clauses should be inserted in the deeds of all schools, to the building of which they contributed, which joined a number of laymen with the clergy as school managers ; the religious teaching being left entirely to the clergy. We are satisfied that no better mode could have been devised for the joint action of Church and State. The alternative was a rate-supported scheme of education for the whole country from the outset. Against the clauses which delegated a share of the management to laymen, and against the whole system of Government grants, the Archdeacon bent all his energies. He had no alternative scheme to propose : he could simply denounce what was done ; and we think there can be little

doubt that the result of his labours has been to promote the success of the cause which he most hated. His denunciations alarmed the timid, and furnished what seemed to be a reason for doing nothing to the apathetic, and so helped to provide an excuse for the unfortunate Act of 1870, by which the religious character of the education of the country has been seriously endangered. Such an Act could never have been passed if the example set by the National Society and its earnest fellow-labourers, whom the Archdeacon most opposes, had been universally followed, and if the Bishops had shown any real appreciation of the importance of religious education for the younger members of their flock.

In Convocation, so long as the questions under discussion chiefly demanded critical skill, the Archdeacon was a prominent and successful leader. This was seen during the debates about Bishop Colenso, and *Essays and Reviews*. But when it was necessary to do more than criticise, the Archdeacon's power began to wane. In the many debates on the Rubrics and Ritualism, he has never seemed able to recognise that the feelings of congregations, resting on the customs of centuries, have to be seriously considered as well as the letter of the law, and that in a country governed by the opinion of the majority it is imperative for the Church to act with wisdom as well as with determination. In the debates on such subjects he generally separated himself from his own friends and united with his opponents, in the hope of defeating that which was not so 'thorough' as he desired it to be. The complaints, therefore, of isolation and desertion by his old supporters, of which there are many, must be read in the light thrown upon his course by the chronicle of Convocation. He seems to have despaired because everything could not remain exactly as it was, or be moulded precisely as he thought it ought to be; and whilst he is conscious that great improvements have been going on around him in individuals and in parishes, he cannot see that such improvements much strengthen the institutions of which the individuals form integral portions. Those who are content to bear much which they dislike, and work on in the faith that for the evils which they lament a remedy will be eventually found, though they cannot yet decide what or when it will be, are the especial objects of the Archdeacon's invectives; he has evidently no sympathy with reforms which demand time, and possibly generations, to work out. And such have been the reforms which the Church has demanded. For a long dark period her children had been content to accept her formularies without attaching that definite meaning to them which they demand for their perfect understanding, or regarding them as the exponents of a system of doctrine and discipline. As life was breathed into what people had contentedly received as dead forms or unmeaning words, they shrank from its manifestations. The State not unnaturally dreaded the unpopularity which approval of the new life would bring with it. It therefore sought to control and depress the Church through its powers of patronage. It has thus laid a heavy burden upon many individual souls; it has deprived the Church at large of the services which might have been rendered to

it by many of its most able clergy, had they been duly promoted; but it has preserved the movement from being corrupted by worldly success. With faith and patience what was designed for the Church's hindrance will tend to her advancement; but to obtain this it is necessary for her sons to be content to bear and forbear, and not to cry out at every arbitrary exhibition of power or one-sided judicial decision, that those who submit are traitors. Happily this is what most faithful Churchmen are content to do, and we doubt not that in a generation or two all that they have a right to ask will be secured. This seems to us a sounder and more Christ-like mode of acting than perpetually singing songs of despair, and thundering out ceaseless protests. Our good friend Archdeacon Denison has not always remembered this, and whilst he has always been ready to fight bravely for what he regarded as the right, we think he has not infrequently been mistaken about what really was the right; whilst of patient waiting for the gradual working out of great principles, and self-denying efforts, he seems absolutely ignorant.

The Supernatural in Nature, a Verification by Free Use of Science.
London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1878.

THIS book belongs to that class of scientific books of which we have recently had several specimens—books written in defence of Christianity from a scientific point of view, and called forth by reaction against the unbelieving colouring given to scientific pursuit by a distinguished but happily small section of scientific men. The author has especially in view members of the medical profession, 'men with keen unconquerable love for scientific study; who, not possessing special religious convictions, nor having any particular expectation of pecuniary advantage, devote themselves, "heart and soul," with intense unselfish devotion, to the study of their own branch of science.' 'For the sake of these, and other truth-loving men, in danger of being beguiled by sophisms of an imperfect science,' the author tells us, 'this book is written.'

The book consists of a series of studies. The first five, the titles of which are 'Is intellect divorced from piety?' 'The supernatural,' 'The threshold of creation,' 'Rudiments of the world,' 'Origin of life and theory of rule,' concern the general argument, and are to a certain extent introductory. Then we have a series of studies on the inspired narrative of creation in its relation to modern science, which perhaps forms the most valuable portion of the work. After that, we have studies on 'The invisible,' 'Variety in nature,' 'The follies of the wise,' in which last the writer severely criticises rash statements by distinguished men of science; and then he concludes with a study on 'The Kingdom of God.'

Our author's conception of the supernatural may be seen from the following:—

'This Power, of which every phenomenon is a manifestation, acts through all bodies, animate and inanimate. If a stone is thrown into the air, or falls on the ground, it is according to definite laws; if a crystal is formed in a solution of salt, if plants grow and flower, if animals are

propagated, if there are perception and formation of thought in man, all these, though Omnipresence is "unthinkable," are the sensible manifestations of a Divine Power, immanent in the cosmos—are proof of the omnipresence of mystery.¹

This is true and good as far as it goes ; but it would have added very much to the weight of the author's argument had he emphasised what forms the turning point between the Theistic and Pantheistic conception of nature. Have both matter and energy a real and separate, though a dependent and created existence? Pantheism denies, Theism affirms ; while there are certain Theists who, while allowing to matter a separate existence, yet regard the Divine Power as ultimately the energy which produces and moves all things. This latter view, however, leads in the long run to enormous speculative difficulties. The only safe position for Theism to assume is that both matter *and* energy have a separate created existence. The Divine or supernatural is then conceived as the Infinite Power which first gives existence to the materials of the world, and then guides and rules them, or in other words, impresses on them the Divine purpose.

Our author's mode of proof may be seen from the following :—

'That nature arises out of, is sustained by, is interpenetrated in every part, and passes into the supernatural, is capable of proof. Every organism, whether animal or plant, possesses, besides the obviously useful arrangements of its organisation, other arrangements, the purpose of which it is utterly impossible to find out. Morphologists look upon the forms of animals and plants as something which cannot be at all explained mechanically. Attempted explanations, by means of descent and modification, rest, for all their power and meaning, on a deep and far-reaching law, at present unknown. Go yet lower : the origin of every simple salt crystal obtained by evaporating its mother liquid, is no less mysterious as to its first cause, and no less incomprehensible in itself than the most complex animal. When gold and silver crystallise in a cubical, bismuth and antimony in a hexagonal, iodine and sulphur in a rhombic form of crystal, the ultimate cause is in every case hidden from us. Resolve all the appearances, properties and movements of things into manifestations of energy within space and time, then energy, space, time, pass all understanding. Even materially and mechanically regarded, our own beginning is unexplainable and full of mystery. The germ, in and with which we began to exist, was, like every other germ, without any discoverable difference ; but in the process of development it acquired the differential characteristics of the sub-kingdoms ; then, successively, the characteristics of its class, order, family, genus, species, race. Come to our own identity or personality, that of which every one is conscious, the most certain of all facts, even this is a thing which cannot be truly known—knowledge of it is forbidden by the very nature of thought. It is unwise, therefore, for atheistic physicists to try to erect so elaborate an argument, and such universal denial, on absolute nescience'—(p. 52).

Elsewhere, the author remarks that in the universe there are three mysteries,—the mystery of matter, the mystery of life, and the mystery of God ; and to enlighten the depths of our ignorance on these, 'we must look for that high aid which none but God can give, we must

believe in the Supernatural, and that the Highest Intellectual Power will at length dominate all inferior energies'—(p. 351).

There are some very striking points which the author makes in the course of his book. As a specimen take the following on the difficulty connected with belief in special Providence :—

'We are asked—"Of what consequence can men, their pleasures or their pains, be to Him in Whose sight all the worlds our eye can see are less than a speck in infinite space?" Thus, those who charge the Bible with narrowness, pervert the splendour of God into a plea that He is too great to love mankind. The Being whom they profess to hallow is made less wise, less good, less wonderful, by the assertion that He cannot and will not visit us. Why should our reason be less firm in structure, or analogy concerning this be entitled to less confidence than when we consider smaller things? If the incalculable multiplication of worlds, and the necessities of a rule that is infinite, hinder not the fashioning of a moth's wing, so that it possess a very firmament of beauty, why should not the All-Good and Holy devise a plan for rendering us good and holy, in a manner as far exceeding human thought and merit as the elaborate many-chambered houses for tiny and invisible life transcend our comprehension?'—(p. 219).

On the whole, the book is a valuable contribution to the defence of Christianity from the scientific point of view. Its weak point, perhaps, is deficiency in speculative knowledge. This leads to the adoption of positions and modes of statement which might be made to tell against the author's contention, and at the same time hinders him from reaping all the fruit he might have reaped from his facts. But any defect in this point of view is compensated by the array of scientific facts which he brings to bear upon every point he discusses. As we have remarked, the studies on the days of creation are in our opinion the most valuable portion of the work; and we could wish that out of the abundant and valuable material therein contained, a small and compact tractate were formed, such as a clergyman could put into the hands of a troubled parishioner, with a reasonable prospect of its being read.

Human Life and its Conditions. Sermons preached before the University of Oxford in 1876-1878. With Three Ordination Sermons. By R. W. CHURCH, M.A., D.C.L., Dean of S. Paul's, 1878. (Macmillan and Co.)

THERE are sermons *and* sermons, as we, at all events, are kept in constant remembrance. And as there is a relative excellence which consists wholly in fitness for a thing's special purpose, there are doubtless many types of 'excellent' sermons, ranging from the 'children's' sermon to that delivered, as were some of these, before the 'grave and reverend signiors' of a University.

The volume before us is hardly even approximately described by the title or rather motto which has been prefixed to it. The first four of them are, as we have said, University Sermons; the last have been preached at Ordinations in various Cathedrals. Each and all are earnest, scholarly, cultured inquiries into some point of Christian faith or practice. They betray the thinker who is habitually in face

of the profoundest problems ; who is persevering in his endeavour to throw light upon such, and who, when he is unable to resolve age-long problems, not seldom suggests lessons of calmness and patient suspense of judgment which are more practically valuable, perhaps, than the categorical yes or no, were the preacher able to give it, would be to the majority of his hearers. Those on Ordination have the advantage of a distinct and practical subject to work out. They supplement each other, and may profitably be read together. They are sermons always thoughtful and elegant, not seldom eloquent : sermons to bear, and indeed to deserve, careful and repeated perusal ; and which will yield up all their import only to such careful reading. Not at all suited, we need hardly say, to poor people ; but emphatically discourses to be preached to preachers ; and calculated to have a considerable shaping influence over the minds of such as really digest them. We subjoin a few paragraphs from the sermon on 'The Two-fold Debt of the Clergy,' as a specimen of the staple of the volume :—

'Such is our position, and it carries with it a double danger : the danger of evading our debt on one side or the other, of thinking of our relations and duty only to one ; of shrinking from force and reach of mind and that which goes with it, independence and boldness—or of shrinking from that slowness, dulness, mean and narrow hardness, which is the outside aspect of the mind of the untaught and poor. And hence the perpetual tendency of religion, among its many other dangers, to become either a mere philosophy to interest, if not to satisfy the inquiring and reflective ; or else a mere popular tradition, suiting itself to the multitude, and lowering itself to gain and hold there. And who shall say which is the worst evil? When Christianity is made to stand aloof either from the 'wise' or from the 'unwise'—when it is viewed simply as a refined theory, fit for those who can think powerfully and deeply, as the noblest attempt of human wisdom, and given over to vague interpretations and indefinite inquiry, or, on the other hand, when its teachers cease to care for thought, knowledge, and truth—either when the Church forgets that its first work is to seek the lost and preach the Gospel to the poor ; or when it seeks *only*, and *by any means*, to establish an influence which it intends to be salutary over the multitudes or the ignorant—it runs the risks which experience shows are not imaginary ones ; it is in danger of becoming such a religion as *can only* be held or conceived of by the few who are able to investigate and study ; or, on the other hand, of sinking to the degradation of a popular faith which can check unchastity, but cannot prevent murder, or which can combine the extreme of enthusiasm with the extreme of dishonesty. I am sure men cannot weigh and balance these opposite mischiefs ; we shall never know till the day of judgment which has been the worst'—(p. 154).

Sermons for the Sundays after Trinity. Part II. Sundays XIII. to End. By the late Rev. JOHN KEBLE, Author of the 'Christian Year.' (Oxford and London : James Parker and Co.)

IN reviewing the first volume of this work we said something as to the special characteristics of these sermons, and of the high value which all English Churchmen will set upon the volumes. Every word which we said of that first volume will apply to the present one ; and not in an indiscriminating eulogy, but with sincere and respect-

ful admiration, we say that these are in many important respects the best sermons we have ever read. Their excellence lies, not so much in intellectual brilliancy, though there is a quiet, sustained power in them which hides itself in a measure, and fulfils the ancient problem, *ars est celare artem*; but in the kindly persuasiveness, in the winningness of their tone, and the pellucid grace of their language. The discourse flows on and on; gently, quietly, simply; and it must be a very strange listener indeed whose interest and assent are not insensibly won. They will form a valuable memorial to generations that knew him not of what Keble was.

Here is the summing up of a difficult problem in a single paragraph; but how pious and yet how intellectually satisfactory it is:—

‘In this then, as in all other things, which concern His people’s good and happiness, our Lord taught us both by word and by His perfect example; and thus we see the true meaning of the proverb about adding a cubit to one’s stature. You cannot do it, muse on it as much as you will. You had better apply yourself to things that are within your power. Very plain and simple the words are; but they are the words of God, and as the wise man says, “Whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever,” so we may not doubt that whatsoever God saith, it is full of deep meaning, more than man can ever find out thoroughly. And here this simple saying, “Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?” contains in itself, rightly understood, a rule and principle which reaches over the whole heart and life of man. The principle I mean is one which the very heathen took notice of, a spirit better than they knew of guiding them no doubt so to do. It is this: all things that are belong to one or other of two kinds: some the Lord our God puts more or less within each man’s own power; others, and by far the greater number, He keeps entirely in *His* power. Our wisdom then and our duty is to care and labour and be anxious about those only which He leaves in some measure to ourselves; as for all other things, we are to leave them quietly to Him, not merely because we cannot help it, as the heathen and unbelievers leave things to the evil spirits whom they call gods; but in true content and cheerfulness, rejoicing to be in all dependent on Him, and that He, our All-wise, All-Holy, All-merciful Father, should have His own way in all things’—(p. 76).

The Foregleams of Christianity: an Essay on the Religious History of Antiquity. By CHARLES NEWTON SCOTT. (London: Smith, Elder and Co.)

A SCHOOL is arising among us of inquirers, who profess to examine the religions of mankind without any bias. Too often it will be found that this profession really means, that the speaker has indeed no bias in favour of any creed, but that he is, perhaps half unconsciously, actuated by a very strong bias against at least one creed, that is to say, the creed of Christendom. Consequently, we welcome with pleasure the work of a student, who, while making full use of a large range of literature furnished by *savans* of all sorts, both English and continental, surveys the field of thought from an avowedly Christian standpoint. Mr. Scott very modestly announces that his aim has been to produce a supplement to the lectures on *The Religions of the World and their Relations to Christianity*, by the late

Rev. F. D. Maurice. Those who are acquainted with that excellent little volume will easily form an idea of the general line of thought pursued by Mr. Scott. It is only just to add that if less original than his predecessor, our author has provided in his small volume of less than 230 pages a richer variety of illustration than even Mr. Maurice. As regards details, we have been most impressed by the comments on religion in Hellas and in ancient Rome. On the view (which we quite accept in the main) of the Catholic faith embracing all that is good in Polytheism, Pantheism, &c., we find most difficulty in following Mr. Scott on the subject of Dualism. But it is quite possible that the fault may lie mainly with us, and that further study may enable us to accept his view on this subject as fully as we do on nearly every other topic which he has touched. Readers of the Hibbert lectures and similar productions will do well to consider the reasonings and conclusions of the book before us.

The Mystery of Pain, Death, and Sin, and Discourses in Refutation of Atheism. By the Rev. CHARLES VOYSEY, B.A., of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, late Vicar of Healaugh. (London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.)

MR. VOYSEY having passed through his destructive phase, has now set himself to reconstruct religion upon the basis of his own intuitions. The attempt, from him, rather seems like a carrying out of the maxim of the French *esprit fort*, who said, 'If there were not a God, it would be necessary to invent one;' for it is a novelty to find him taking the Theistic (we cannot say the Christian) side, and arguing in favour of a conclusion which many of his present contemporaries plainly disavow. Still we owe him thanks for showing that the Being and the beneficence of God can be successfully defended even from that rationalist platform which he has unhappily chosen to take up. He rightly points out that pain occupies but a comparatively small portion of man's life; that it constantly acts as a guard and signal of danger to sentient creatures, with sensitive organisations; and that in many cases it supplies the antecedent condition of enjoyment, actually heightens the subsequent pleasure, and gives a zest to it. Furthermore, that the susceptibility to pleasure implies also the susceptibility to pain. And then the great use of pain as a means of training and discipline is well dwelt upon. In the following address he speaks of the apparent pain of animals, which has so often weighed upon the minds of thinkers as an impeachment of the Divine beneficence in creation, and suggests that these suffering creatures may not, after all, be so sensitive to pain as they appear; and that 'we have no right to project man's experience into our idea of the sensitiveness of the lower tribes of creation.' How far this suggestion may be tenable we have no means of knowing. Certainly, it is very doubtful ground to take up. But a large part of animal suffering may be referred to the consequences of human sin; and this Mr. Voysey has apparently overlooked. He is far more successful in what we may perhaps call his 'Apology for Death.' There is a certain weird power of fancy in such a passage as this:—

'Imagine, if you can, that from this time forth God were to decree that there should be no more death upon the earth. That here we should continue to live without possibility of change or decay, our immortal and aspiring spirits ever tied down to the scenes and interests of this lower world, never to soar into those higher regions of knowledge and activity for which we feel sure that we have been born. Not a man or woman amongst us, with good sense and feeling, would hear the sentence of such a doom without despair. It would cut off at one blow that felicity which is acknowledged by all mankind to be the greatest upon the earth—the bliss of parentage. It would be impossible for us to increase and multiply without re-introducing disease and death. Little children there would be none. All would become men and women, and remain so for ever and ever, with more than half the light and gladness of human bliss shut out. The present changes which, with all their sadness, help so much to sustain life, and to improve human nature, would give place to a monotony, under the pressure of which the brain would give way, and the world would go quickly mad. Is life a blessing? To what do we owe its possibility for ourselves? Surely to the ravages of death, which have made room for us. A perpetual stream of new individuals is being poured into the gaps which death has made; and so, however selfishly our ancestors might have clung to life, they were forced to give way that we too might live and have in our turn a sweet taste of existence. But is this all? Can any one fairly reason on this subject, while excluding the grand hope of immortality, which has been a leading characteristic of the human race? Is it not permissible to us to add to the many good reasons for death and perpetual succession the highly probable conjecture that death is but the entrance into a higher life, and that we only describe that last earthly crisis in literal exactness when we say that death is God's messenger sent to call us to His home above?'—(p. 52).

But what a strange and suggestive spectacle it is to see one who reduces 'life and immortality' to a 'highly probable conjecture' thus making friends with 'the last enemy,' on the ground of its having swept away our predecessors to give us standing room! But we cannot read far without finding many a sentence indicative of the writer's advanced scepticism, and altogether painful to read. Still, these discourses are indicative of an acute and active, though not a powerful mind, and of one who sets himself seriously to think out the great problems of life, as far as he can. It wants patience, and it wants also humility; but it is obviously sincere, and not consciously unfair. We could almost persuade ourselves that we see indications in these pages of a recoil from that 'lower deep' of unbelief which is so often the penalty of revolt against the Christian faith. May it prove to be so!

Bible Studies. By M. M. KALISCH, Ph.D., M.A. Part II. The Book of Jonah, preceded by a Treatise on the Hebrew and the Stranger. (London: Longmans, Green and Co.)

WE noticed the first part of this work in our January number, and this, Part II., is perhaps of even greater interest than the former. The strangeness and isolation of its subject matter, the unexampled nature of the mission entrusted to the hero—a Jewish prophet sent forth to a heathen people—and the remarkable incidents by which

that mission was attended, all combine to invest it with a peculiar interest. The ordinary reader is arrested by the dramatic rapidity and intenseness of the events; the thinker has no less a remarkable moral problem forced unmistakably upon his notice—that of the working on character, and of the efficacy, moral and physical, of repentance. Dr. Kalisch begins by allowing that there is no necessity whatever for departing from the 'Biblical records,' but he is of opinion that the book which is called by the name of Jonah was not written by him, though it narrates his history. He takes the miraculous machinery of the story to be purely symbolic; though he rejects, somewhat hesitatingly, the hypothesis of Rosenmüller, that the myth of the Phœnician Hercules is the source of the story of Jonah, and even the idea that the two have any connexion whatever. The preliminary dissertation, however, bears most unfairly against the Hebrew legislation and history. He appears to rejoice in affixing to every statement the most unfavourable construction that it will bear. Bluntly and *sans circonstance*, he asserts that 'the accounts of the Book of Joshua [were] compiled many centuries afterwards, in the light of later occurrences, and in the spirit of a later age'—(p. 24). Obviously, a view of the foreign affairs of the Hebrew nation, which is founded on inversions of history and perversions of philosophy, can lay claim to no authority beyond that of its originator. Dr. Kalisch first exaggerates the harshness with which the Hebrews treated the remainder of the Canaanites, and, on the other hand, overrates the degree of approach which the later Hebrew literature and the national public opinion made farther on in such non-Hebrew nations as the Persians, the Assyrians, or the Greeks.

Notwithstanding all this, the scholar who can discriminate may learn much from the treatise, which is marked by wide learning and great industry.

South Africa. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. Two Volumes. (1878.)

THE principal British Colony in Southern Africa, that of which Cape-town is the capital, is one of our possessions, like Canada in North America, which we were not the first to people with men of European blood and Christian faith, but which we acquired by conquest from the Dutch. It is also our latest acquisition of that kind, its annexation to our dominion only dating from the present century; yet it may be questioned whether there are many settlements belonging to any nation where the settlers feel more at home, as may be inferred from the sister colonies, which, in the short space of fifty years, it has gathered round it. British Kaffraria; Port Natal; Griqualand, better known among ourselves by its tempting title of 'The Diamond Fields;' and the Transvaal, have all been founded in the reign of her present Majesty, or her uncles. And, it is to the circumstances under which the last-mentioned state was added to the cluster, that we are indebted to the book before us. Mr. Trollope, favourably known to the literary world as one of the cleverest novelists of the day, had, as he tells us, seen all our great groups of colonies; having, we believe, visited them at different times in discharge of his official duties at the

Post Office. But he had not been in Southern Africa, and he was revolving in mind plans for completing his circle of travel, and learning from personal experience whether the great southern promontory better deserved the title given to it by Diaz, who had seen it, or that which was conferred on it by his king who had not;¹ and mingling with his desire some doubts whether he was not becoming too old for such expeditions, when the sides of his intent were suddenly and irresistibly spurred by the intelligence that 'a sturdy Englishman had walked into the Transvaal Republic with five and twenty policemen and a Union Jack, and had taken possession of it' (i. 3); and that Sir Theophilus Shipstone had ratified the bold deed by formally annexing the province to the British dominion. No wonder that 'the newspapers became full of the Transvaal Republic,' or that Mr. Trollope decided that 'now, if ever, he must visit South Africa.' Accordingly he took a berth in a Cape steamer, procured letters of introduction, bought up compendiums of South African History and Geography, of Kaffir Laws and Customs, Handbooks to South Africa, &c., &c.; and, before the summer was over, landed at Capetown, in a mist so thick that he could not even see the Table Mountain. And he at once began to write his book, if indeed he had not already beguiled the monotony of his voyage out by putting together the preliminary chapters, which are devoted to an account of the Early Dutch history, the English history, the population, &c., of what we may call the mother colony; and which are manifestly compiled from the little library which his foresight had included among what we therefore suppose we must not class among his *impedimenta*. It is with what we may call the second 'book' that he begins to give us the results of his personal experience; that being occupied with the Cape Colony; the third with Natal; the fourth with the Transvaal; the fifth with Griqualand West, or the Diamond Fields; the sixth with the Free Orange State, which as yet maintains its independence, and, in Mr. Trollope's opinion, is not likely willingly to exchange it for the protection of England (ii. 228); while the seventh and last gives a brief description of a few native districts, towns, and tribes, which, to quote Mr. Trollope's rather ominous language, 'cannot as yet be said to form a part of the British Empire.' And the author winds up rather oddly with an apology which, to a certain extent, admits the truth of the charges which he foresees will be brought against his work. 'It will be brought against me as an accusation, that I have made my inquiries and have written my book in a hurry. It has been done hurriedly.' . . . 'A book so written must often be inaccurate.' . . . 'To spend five years in studying a country, and then to come home and devote five more to writing a book about it is altogether out of my way' (ii. 328-9). It certainly does bear the marks of hurry; and it is also not free from a fault which we have before now had to condemn in more elaborate works, the un-

¹ Diaz called it *Capo Tormentoso*, from the terrible storm he encountered on reaching it. But King John changed the name to that of *Bona Esperanza*, in allusion to the advantages he hoped to gain from the discovery of the new route to the East.

scholarlike fondness for coining new and often ill-formed words. At the very outset we find 'improvised,' for labouring under a scarcity of provisions (i. 3); 'inhospitable,' for inhospitable. But, though bound to protest against such needless blemishes, we are inclined to agree with the author, that 'his work may possibly have something in it of freshness to atone for them.' The whole country which he describes is interesting and important; what is not new in his sketches is yet brought most conveniently together in a compact form; and by far the greater part is, so far as we are aware, new. We have certainly not seen before any description of Natal, of the Diamond Fields, or of the Transvaal, beyond that given in a few scattered and occasional letters in the newspapers; and we cannot refuse to admit that he seems also entitled to the praise, which he is not afraid to claim, of impartiality and candour (ii. 328). His aim has certainly been to tell the exact truth, as far as he could ascertain it, even though he cannot help suspecting that he shall offend some of those who received him with friendly hospitality in Africa, and though he has no doubt at all that many of his statements, and perhaps still more of his opinions, will be distasteful to parties at Exeter Hall or in the House of Commons.

A book written in this spirit, even if not altogether faultless, is still of great use. Handbooks are among the most convenient inventions of the present generation, and Mr. Trollope's is a somewhat more elaborate handbook than we are accustomed to meet with even about the most generally visited countries. He gives us not only a very fair account of the mode in which we have gradually extended our dominion, and founded the subordinate colonies; but he discusses the propriety of our conduct with a candid perception and admission of the truth, that, in these as in most other questions, there 'is much to be said on both sides.' The question, as he puts it, is 'What is the duty of the white man in reference to the original inhabitant?' (i. 183); and, according to him the principles of the earlier Dutch, and the more recent British settler differ widely from each other, though the conclusion to which they both have come is much the same; the native of course differing with both.

'The Kaffir will say that it is the white man's duty to stay away, and not to touch what does not belong to him. The Dutch colonist asserts that it is the white man's duty to make the best he can of the good things God has provided for his use; and that, as the Kaffir in his natural state is a bad thing, he should either be got rid of, or made a slave. In either assertion there is an intelligible purpose, capable of a logical argument. But the Briton has to go between the two, wavering much between the extremes of philosophy and expansive energy. He knows that he has to get possession of the land and use it, and he is determined that he will do so; but he knows also that it is wrong to take what does not belong to him, and wrong also to treat another human being with harshness; and, therefore, with one hand he waves his humanitarian principles over Exeter Hall, while with the other he annexes province after province. As I am myself a Briton, I am not a fair critic of the proceeding; but it does not seem to me that he is upon the whole beneficent, though occasionally very unjust' (i. 184).

We have not space to follow our author in his examination how this British rule of ours, beneficently exercised at least, if not in every instance righteously established, is seen to work in the different provinces, and must content ourselves with referring briefly to his account of the diamond mines in Griqualand West, which we only appropriated seven years ago, by an act which combined forcible seizure with purchase, since we paid the Orange Free State 90,000*l.* for the abandonment of its claims to the territory. It certainly is a district interesting from the greatness of the change which has come over it. Ten years ago, 'it was as little valuable, perhaps, as any land on the earth's surface, lying adjacent to British territory' (ii. 140). But in 1867 a diamond was found, of fair size and quality. The next year the happy finder heard of another; it proved to be larger and purer. He gave all his sheep and all his horses to become its owner; and proved a judicious buyer, for it weighed 83 carats, and he sold it to a diamond merchant for 11,200*l.* Every one at once set to work to hunt for diamonds. By the year 1872, 'diamond digging commenced as a settled industry;' and one of its first fruits was a superb stone of 288 carats. Dreams of boundless wealth opened at once on the minds of all who heard of such a price, English, Dutch, or natives. Mines were opened in different quarters; the most valuable of which is the 'great Kimberley mine,' as it is called, from the nobleman who then held the seals of the Colonial Office; which has already proved productive beyond, probably, any spot of equal extent on the face of the earth. It is estimated at nine acres only; but even that small space is divided into more than 400 claims or allotments (171); and it is calculated that 'diamonds to the value of 12,000,000*l.* have already been extracted from it' (153), without reckoning those which have been stolen by the Kaffirs employed in digging and filtering, which some calculations would estimate at three millions more. The town of Kimberley, which may be called the child of the mine, has already become the largest in South Africa, with the exception of Capetown itself, having a population of 18,000, of whom nearly half are Europeans. And, though Mr. Trollope can quote Horace, and admits that *aurum* is better *irreperitum*, and that 'there is a similar stain also sticking to diamonds' (202); he yet argues that, if ever an exception to the poet's classification of *opes* as *irritamenta malorum* ought to be made, it should be in the land of the Kaffirs, who 'ten years since were living in the wildest state of unalloyed savagery,' but who now flock to the Kimberley mine for work, because 'they have learned the loveliness of 10*s.* a week paid regularly into their hands every Saturday night. Who can doubt,' says Mr. Trollope, warming with a zeal which combines philanthropy with the soundest political economy, 'who can doubt but that work is the great civiliser of the world: work, and the growing desire for those good things which work only will bring?' In seeking work and wages, 'they have already put themselves on the path towards civilisation.' It cannot be considered a step taken before it was needed. Even after six years' intercourse with Europeans, the Kaffirs are still 'thieves,' though 'not often of other things but diamonds. They are

not Christians ; they do not yet care much about breeches ; they do not go to school ; but they are already orderly ;' and Mr. Trollope has no doubt, that 'European habits will gradually bring about religion' (ii. 187-8). And, what diamond mines are doing in Griqualand, similar causes will bring about in other districts. 'There are already copper mines at work in Namaqualand, on the Western coast, lead mines and gold fields in the Transvaal ;' and, as years roll on, these districts he foresees 'will become hives of coloured labour ; and in this way Kimberleys will arise in various parts of the continent' (190).

To the Transvaal, Mr. Trollope devotes a larger space of his second volume, though we can do no more than refer to his statement of the reasons which constitute our justification for annexing it. Its incorporation with the British dominions is not yet a year old, dating only from August 12, 1877 ; but in his view the annexation was forced upon us, unless we preferred withdrawing from the whole of the adjacent district. The province was surrounded by Zulus on the west, by Portuguese on the north-west, by Dutchmen on the south and south-west, as well as by ourselves on the south and south-east ; and the boundaries on every side were so ill-defined, Dutch, Portuguese, and natives all claiming to extend their limits ; and the claims they advanced were 'so ambiguous, so progressive, and so indefinite that to have yielded to them would have been to give up the whole country' (ii. 27). What were we to do ? 'In dealing with the natives as to boundaries, nothing can be got by yielding ; nor does it seem possible to trust to abstract justice :' indeed 'it would have been impossible for abstract justice to have drawn a line, so confused had the matter become. It can only be done by a strong hand ; and can only be done well by a strong hand, guided by a desire equally strong to do right' (28). So Sir Theophilus Shipstone, strong with both kinds of strength, annexed the whole country ; and, though Mr. Trollope is not without a suspicion that such a cutting of the knot was a somewhat high-handed proceeding, he has no doubt at all that the whole country was benefited by it. 'Whether Great Britain had done right or wrong to annex the Transvaal, every sod of its soil had instantly been made of double value to its proprietor by the deed which had been done' (ii. 4). Such a result, if not an absolute justification of such annexations, can hardly be desired to supply a strong argument for a favourable construction of the motives of the annexing authorities. The extension of civilisation is surely a blessing to the whole race of mankind ; and a nation which succeeds in combining this end with the increase of the material prosperity of those over whom it assumes the sovereignty, has at least some claim to be regarded as well deserving the power which it exerts so beneficently.

A Narrative of the Voyage to the Polar Sea during 1875-76 in H.M. Ships 'Alert' and 'Discovery.' By Captain Sir G. S. NARES, R.N., K.C.B., F.R.S., Commander of the Expedition. With Notes on the Natural History. Edited by H. W. FEILDEN, F.G.S., C.M.Z.S., F.R.G.S., Naturalist to the Expedition. In Two Volumes. 1878.

EVER since the Treaty of Versailles, which in 1763 terminated the Seven Years' War, travels and voyages of discovery have been among the most favourite enterprises of our countrymen. And there have been few which have won for those who have successfully accomplished them a more universal, a more enduring, or a better deserved fame. Cook, Flinders, Parry, Ross, Franklin, and their comrades, traversed the most remote parts of the Northern and Southern Oceans, encountering dangers and hardships previously unimagined; in more than one instance (sad to say), at the sacrifice of their lives: adding largely to the dominions of their native country, and not less to the scientific knowledge of the whole world. Bruce, Park, Clapperton, Lander, and, in our own generation, Baker, Livingstone, and Cameron, have explored, it may now be said, every part of Africa, compelling the Nile, that problem of ages, to show once more the head which, when Phaeton had dried up his mouths into dust, he succeeded in saving from the conflagration, and hiding from mortal sight till the present day; opening new fields for commercial energy, for the spread of civilisation and Christianity; but also, alas, in too many instances, like their naval rivals, sealing their success with their blood. But there has been one marked difference between the explorations of these, our peaceful heroes, by land and by sea; that, while those on land have, generally speaking, been private undertakings, our naval discoveries have been, in every instance, sent forth by the Government. And of the last of these, the volumes before us are a record, not the less interesting, and certainly not the less trustworthy, because they are written in a plain unambitious style, free from any attempt at self-glorification; showing that the object of the author has been to give the world a minute and faithful account of all that was done, seen, and ascertained, and not less of what was unsuccessfully attempted; and to do full justice to his gallant comrades; to tell the tale of their achievements, and of the skill, patience, and fortitude, by which they were accomplished; but to say as little as possible of himself, trusting to others to establish his own claim to a high place in the roll of our Arctic heroes.

The first expedition to the Arctic regions of what we may call modern times, memorable, if for nothing else, as being that in which Nelson, then a boy, only fourteen years of age, first gave proof of his energetic fearless character, was sent out with orders to attempt to reach the North Pole. But, when the close of the great French war left our Government again at leisure to prosecute peaceful enterprises, the object aimed at was the discovery of what was called the North-West Passage, in other words, of a shorter road to India and China than that which lay round the Southern extremity of Africa. It was

an idea which had preceded that of reaching the Pole : for it was that which, in the reign of Elizabeth, had sent forth Frobisher, Davis, Hudson, and Baffin ; some of whose names are preserved to this day by straits and bays which still form the principal highway to the North. But it was one which the experience of a very few years sufficed to prove impracticable. Parry's third voyage was generally held to have established the fact that, even if a North-Western passage should be found to exist (a matter of which, it may be said in passing, he still felt fully assured), it could never be available as a safe and certain road for traffic, and, in deference to his strongly expressed opinion on this point, when in 1827 the Government despatched him on a fourth voyage, the discovery of the North Pole was the object of this new expedition. He did, indeed, reach a latitude more northern by a whole degree than had been attained by any previous navigator ; but the result of his toils was, perhaps, even more unfavourable to the attainment of the goal he sought than that of his previous voyages. For though, after leaving his ship, the 'Hecla,' at Spitzbergen, he trusted for his further progress to sledging over the ice, he found that, as the season grew warmer, the ice on which he was travelling drifted to the southward with a rapidity which overpowered all his efforts to proceed in a contrary direction ; and that for every three miles to the North that he and his crew could advance by sledging, the drift of the ice was bearing them four miles to the South.

After such decided failures in both directions, failures which it was evident no courage or skill possibly have avoided, it is not strange that Arctic expeditions were for a while laid aside. But at the end of nearly twenty years, the impatience of our seamen at the inactivity of the protracted peace, and their natural eagerness for distinction, of whatever kind and however to be won, overbore the prudence of the Government ; and in 1845 they despatched Sir John Franklin, an officer who, as far back as 1821, had made for himself a high reputation by his successful exploration of the northern coast of America—on a fresh search for the North-West Passage, which proved more disastrous than any similar enterprise. How every man of two as gallant crews as ever sailed from Spithead perished is known to all. The heroism with which they endured their unsurpassed sufferings may be faintly conceived by all who can appreciate the spirit which actuates the whole of our naval service ; but the very completeness of their destruction has mercifully spared the survivors the precise details of their protracted miseries. While their fate was uncertain other expeditions were sent out to search for the missing crews. But all notion of finding an available North-West Passage was buried for ever in the graves of Franklin and Crozier, though one of the parties in search of them did ascertain not only the fact that a passage did exist, but that Franklin's followers had themselves completed the circuit, when they, coming from the East, reached the Great Fish River, to which Captain Back had already penetrated from the West.

That terrible disaster quenched for a time all inclination to send

forth other expeditions to the same regions. But by lapse of time the impression became fainter. After twenty years of European peace our sailors began to long for some field in which to distinguish themselves; and the Geographical and other scientific Societies once more pressed upon the Government the belief that an exploration of some of the Arctic lands which might still be said to be unknown, might produce beneficial results, and, in the words of the sailing orders with which the Commander of the Expedition was subsequently furnished, might promote 'the advancement of science and natural knowledge.' The Cabinet yielded to their arguments, and in the spring of 1875 equipped two ships, the 'Alert' and 'Discovery,' for the voyage, recalling Captain Nares from the 'Challenger' to take the command of the expedition.

His orders, to which we have already referred, pointed out that his first object was to be to reach the Pole; or, if that should prove impracticable, to attain 'the highest possible northern latitude' (Introduction by Sir G. H. Richards, p. xxxiv). But 'other subordinate and collateral objects, both of a geographical and of a purely scientific kind' were also to be kept in view. And on this account a naturalist was attached to each ship; one of whom, Captain Fielden, R.A., has enriched the volumes before us with some valuable observations on the animals and geology of the district visited.

In May 1875 the Expedition sailed from Portsmouth. Its course had been marked out for it with great precision in the Admiralty orders. The ships were to make a halt on the coast of West Greenland for dogs and Eskimo sledge-drivers; and, after furnishing themselves sufficiently with these indispensable coadjutors, 'to proceed up Smith Sound with all speed,' erecting cairns and depositing records of their proceeding as they advanced, and selecting such winter quarters as should be most suitable as starting-points for the sledging expeditions by which, if by any means, the desired goal was to be attained, and which were to be commenced with the first appearance of spring in 1876.

The orders were carried out with the most minute attention, and with skill, such as might have been expected from a commander of Captain Nares' experience; for, as one of the crew of the 'Resolute' under Captain Austen in 1852, and Captain Kellett in 1854, he had had ample experience of the difficulties of Arctic exploration, and of the means by which alone they could be surmounted. The weather was comparatively favourable, and by the end of the first week in September the travellers had reached a bay on the eastern coast of Grinnell's Land, in N. lat. $82^{\circ} 21'$, where the 'Alert' went into winter quarters; the 'Discovery,' under Captain Stephenson, having been left, a few days earlier, some 70 or 80 miles more to the southward. Seven months did they pass in this awful solitude, beguiling the evenings with lectures on astronomy, theatricals, and the conjuring tricks of the Wizard of the North, as one of the officers, Commander Markham, very appropriately dubbed himself; and, as long as there was any daylight, by excursions in pursuit of game, in which the

sportsmen were very fairly successful, musk oxen, ptarmigan, hares, and several varieties of ducks and geese rewarding their toil, and varying their dinners. But for nearly five months they were cut off from this resource by the disappearance of the sun, who left them in the middle of October, and did not gladden their eyes again till the 4th of March.

His reappearance was the signal for preparing the sledges for their journeys in various directions; since it was to them alone that the planners and promoters of the expedition trusted for the accomplishment of any of its objects. But, though every one of the crew petitioned earnestly to be employed on these trips, it was no very luxurious mode of travelling, under such conditions as were imposed on our adventurers, and we may quote Captain Nares' description of its hardships as a specimen of some of the difficulties they had to encounter, as well as of his own clear unpretending style of narrative.

'The popular supposition that sledge travelling with dogs in the Arctic expeditions is a comfortable, expeditious, and exciting method of locomotion, is very far from the truth. With a light sledge, perfectly smooth ice, and a good team of dogs, rapid journeys may be made over great distances, where supplies of food for only a few days have to be carried on the sledge. Dog-sledging, as practised by naval expeditions in districts where food cannot be obtained on the road, is necessarily of a different nature. The object frequently being to prolong the journey to the utmost extent, or, in other words, to enable the sledges to be absent from their ship the greatest number of days, the sledge at starting is loaded to the full amount of provisions and gear that the dogs can draw with the aid of the men. The driver walks or runs at the side of the sledge, guiding the animals with his whip, while another of the party runs ahead, choosing the best path through the piled up hummocks or rough ice, the rest of the crew pushing the sledge from behind; but very frequently they have to use their drag-belts. Owing to the repeated delays among rough ice, where the dogs stubbornly refuse to do any work whatever, and the men pulling the sledge have to drag it three or four feet at a time by standing pulls, the rate of advance is seldom over two or three miles an hour. In fact, the crew of a dog-sledge have even more laborious work than those who draw a man-sledge'—(i. 270).

Yet in spite of these drawbacks one party, that headed by Commander Markham, succeeded in reaching a latitude a full degree more to the north than had ever yet been attained by any traveller of any nation. On the 12th of May, 1876 an unusually clear day enabled him to take an observation, which showed that his party was within 400 miles of the Pole, in latitude $83^{\circ} 20' 26''$.

It was all that could be done. To accomplish this advance had been the work of forty days. He had expended more than half of his provisions, and had scarcely enough left to last till he could regain the ship. Moreover, he had a misfortune to contend with far heavier than the worst difficulties of sledging, severe as we have seen them to be. More than half his men were prostrated with scurvy. And so, though not without a feeling of bitter disappointment, he resolved to retrace his steps, as the sole means of saving the lives of the invalids. And even they could not all be saved, one,

George Porter, dying five days before they could rejoin the 'Alert.' Some of the other sledging parties suffered even more severely. And after the return of the Expedition, Captain Nares did not escape animadversion, on the ground that he had neglected to furnish the sledges with lime-juice, though he had a supply on board. The question was eagerly canvassed; and we confess that we think his defence complete. He argued that in former expeditions lime-juice had not been considered indispensable; that where it had been possible to employ it, it had often failed to save the men from the disease; while other crews which had not used it had been comparatively healthy; and finally that in this instance it must have been useless, since it was frozen into a mass so solid and hard that the men could have had no means of melting it; as indeed had been the case in 1852 and 1854, in a far more southern latitude.

By the last week in June all the sledging parties had rejoined the 'Alert,' and it did not require long consideration to decide that the expedition must be abandoned. Out of the Alert's crew of fifty-three men, there were only nine 'fit for hard work.' Captain Nares therefore quitted his winter quarters to rejoin the 'Discovery,' and when he reached her, he found that her crew was in no respect in better condition; indeed she had lost more men than the 'Alert.' He therefore at once decided to return to England. But the weather was so unfavourable, and the ice still so solid, that it was August 20 before the two ships could leave their anchorage. And even then their dangers were not at an end. They had to contend with storms of unusual violence; they were more than once beset with impenetrable fogs; they were a whole fortnight reaching Allman Bay, scarcely 120 miles from the winter quarters of the 'Discovery;' while the ice in front seemed so unbroken that they even anticipated the possibility of having to pass a second winter in the North, and began to calculate with no little anxiety how it would be possible to husband their coal. At last, on September 6, the ice began to move, and on the 7th a channel was cleared, of which they promptly took advantage. Still their progress was slow; and it took them nine days more to reach Lancaster Sound. Nor was it till October 4 that they recrossed the Arctic circle. From that day their progress, if slow, was steady, and on November 2 they entered Portsmouth Harbour, to receive 'the hearty congratulations' of the Queen; which were cordially re-echoed by the whole service and the whole nation.

Sir G. Nares, in his preface, endorsing the last sentence of Commander Markham's Report (i. 395) asserts his conviction that the failure 'to realise the expectations which had been entertained of reaching the North Pole was due solely to the fact that the North Pole is unattainable by the Smith Sound route.' And Admiral Richards, in his Introduction to these volumes, to which we have already referred, sums up the result of the Expedition by saying that 'if the main object of the explorers was not attained, it cannot be said that they were less successful than any of their predecessors. The bold and skilful seamanship which carried the ships to the extreme limits of navigation, and placed the "Alert" alone in a position

in which no ship had ever passed an Arctic winter, was worthy of the leader, and an earnest of what would have been accomplished had it been in man's power to command success. The subsequent deeds of the officers and crews under circumstances of trial and suffering which have rarely been equalled, can never be surpassed'—(xxxviii).

But, though the gallant admiral, than whom no one is better able to estimate the difficulties of such expeditions, or the practicability and value, in all their bearings, of the objects aimed at by them, refuses to speak of this last voyage as having failed, or even to pronounce positively that its objects can never be accomplished, he still thinks it 'more than questionable' whether it be justifiable to send out another such expedition 'at the cost of so much suffering and so much treasure. Geography has little to gain by it; science perhaps less.' And he points out that 'there are wide fields for geographical and scientific research in other regions by which the whole human race would be gainers' (Introd. xl). He evidently implies an opinion that it is in those other regions that England should henceforth exert her energies, and we confess that we agree with him. We would be the last to undervalue that enterprising eagerness for fame

'that the clear spirit doth raise
To scorn delights, and live laborious days'—

which has been the parent of so many noble deeds, and which, we are proud to say, has never associated more heroic souls in any country than in our own. But, going a little beyond Admiral Richards in this, we do believe that both the objects hitherto aimed at by Arctic expeditions have been conclusively proved to be unattainable, while it is clear that they cannot be pursued except at the almost certain cost of valuable lives, and of a permanent undermining of the constitutions even of those who return in apparent safety. The fact is not without its significance, that of all our explorers of those Northern Seas, Sir John Ross and Sir G. Back, whose decease has occurred while these sheets were going through the press, are, as we believe, the only ones who have ever seen a seventieth birthday. And our sailors deserve better of their country than that they should be sacrificed in the pursuit of objects almost certainly unattainable, and if attained, in the opinion of such judges as Admiral Richards, of very small and doubtful value.

While, therefore, we gladly contribute our meed of admiration to the crews of the 'Alert' and 'Discovery,' we cannot forbear expressing a hope that the journal of their commander is the record of the last Arctic expedition.

History of the English People. By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A.
Vol. II. 'The Monarchy,' 1461-1540. 'The Reformation,'
1540-1603. (Macmillan and Co.)

THIS second volume of Mr. Green's work is as attractive, as brilliant, and as philosophical as the first. As dynasty after dynasty are bowed off the stage of history, he shows no inability to realise the new actors under the new conditions. The reader may not always

like his *rationale* of English history, but it is always a vigorous one ; and is sure to excite either attraction or repulsion in a considerable degree.

There is, it may be allowed, a considerable amount of cross division always unavoidable in a history, which attempts a philosophical classification of the facts ; and it was probably not to be helped that Mr. Green should label the period from 1461 to 1540 'The Monarchy,' and that from 1540 to 1603 'The Reformation,' though the monarchy of Mary or of Elizabeth which falls *after* 1540, was to the full as imperious and as ruthless as that of the earlier Tudors ; or, again, though the movement towards Reformation, or, at all events, towards unsettlement, was as pronounced in the reign of Henry VIII. as it was at any time afterwards. Mr. Green has rightly discerned in the one case as in the other, that the *predominant* force out of many political energies was that which he has seized as the characteristic of each period.

With few exceptions each of these chapters is a monograph ; and may be read for its own sake, not merely as a link in the narrative. Among these many brilliant episodes, there is none which the author has conceived with more life and colour, or put upon his pages with greater spirit, than that of the 'Revival of Learning.' He gives willing and liberal appreciation to the leaders of the 'new Learning,' or, as he calls it, the 'Renaissance,' Colet, Erasmus, More, Archbishop Warham. His sketch of the latter has been elaborated with a care, not unnatural in an author who himself writes from Lambeth Palace, in whose halls the kindly Archbishop once dispensed his hospitalities, and may be thought an oblique compliment to his patron, the present occupant of the see. We may quote it, though it is somewhat long :—

'Learning found a yet warmer friend in the Archbishop of Canterbury. Immersed as Archbishop Warham was in the business of the State, he was no mere politician. The eulogies which Erasmus lavished on him while he lived—his praises of the Primate's learning, of his ability in business, his pleasant humour, his modesty, his fidelity to friends, may pass for what eulogies of living men are commonly worth. But it is difficult to doubt the sincerity of the glowing picture which he drew of him when death had destroyed all interest in mere adulation. The letters, indeed, which passed between the Churchman and the wandering scholar, the quiet, simple-hearted grace which, amidst constant instances of munificence, preserved the perfect equality of literary friendship, the enlightened piety to which Erasmus could address the noble words of his preface to S. Jerome, confirm the judgment of every good man of Warham's day. The Archbishop's life was a simple one ; and an hour's pleasant reading, a quiet chat with some learned new comer, alone broke the endless round of civil and ecclesiastical business. Few men realised so thoroughly as Warham the new conception of an intellectual and moral equality before which the old social distinctions of the world were to vanish away. His favourite relaxation was to sup among a group of scholarly visitors, enjoying their fun, and retorting with fun of his own. Colet, who had now become Dean of S. Paul's, and whose sermons were stirring all London, might often be seen with Grocyn and Linacre at the Primate's board. There, too, might probably have been seen Thomas More, who, young as he was, was already famous through his lectures at S. Lawrence on "The City of God." But the scholar-world found more than supper or

fun at the Primate's board. His purse was ever open to relieve their poverty. "Had I found such a patron in my youth," Erasmus wrote long after, "I, too, might have been counted among the fortunate ones." It was with Grocyn that Erasmus, on a second visit to England, rowed up the river to Warham's board at Lambeth, and, in spite of an unpromising beginning, the acquaintance turned out wonderfully well. The Primate loved him, Erasmus wrote home, as if he were his father, or his brother, and his generosity surpassed that of all his friends. He offered him a sinecure, and when he declined it he bestowed on him a pension of a hundred crowns a year. When Erasmus wandered to Paris, it was Warham's invitation which recalled him to England. When the rest of his patrons left him to starve on the sour beer of Cambridge, it was Warham who sent him fifty angels. "I wish there were thirty legions of them," the Primate puns in his good-humoured way'—(p. 83).

His estimate of the young King Henry VIII. is very high: and he hardly seems to make sufficient allowance, in describing the king's qualities with extravagant praise, as he does, for the courtly adulation, which was the besetting sin of the age, to a degree which arouses the reader's surprise, and almost contempt. He is an admirer of Henry almost to the degree of Mr. Froude, which is saying much. No one would gather from his pages, that if ever there was a wicked man upon earth, it was Henry VIII. of England; and the more repulsive because he endeavoured to veil his vices with pretences of religion. It is significant, in regard to this, to look at the characters of the ministers and tools with whom he chose to work. Those who were not weak were wicked; and those who were not wicked were almost without exception, weak. Such as were neither wicked nor weak refused to be the agents of his designs; stopped short at some point or other of obedience; and then met their deaths at his hands. Of the one class Cromwell is the most conspicuous example; of the other Cranmer. Mr. Green's sketch of the destroyer of the monasteries is powerful and repulsive. He does not deny the great powers and unbending will of that bold, bad man, the unscrupulous instrument of a sovereign, whose ruthless passions he fooled and encouraged to the very top of their bent. But it is really impossible to 'whitewash' so mere a ruffian; and Mr. Green, though too favourable to him, as we think, in some respects, does not even attempt to do so. He died unpitied as he had lived unpitying; and his fame is a thing with which no historian concerns himself.

Space will not suffer us to comment, point by point, on the remainder of Mr. Green's narrative. But we must give a word of cordial appreciation to his portraiture of Elizabeth, which is full of insight and vigour. The volume will be very helpful to such as will, without taking it as an infallible guide, use it to quicken their conceptions of the actors in the great drama of the sixteenth century, and of the connexion of the facts of its history.

Nouveaux Mélanges d'Archéologie, d'Histoire et de Littérature sur le Moyen-âge. Par le P. C. CAHIER et le P. A. MARTIN, de la Société de Jésus. 4to. Vol. IV. Bibliothèques. (Paris: Firmin Didot.)

SOME years ago Fathers Martin and Cahier, of the Society of Jesus,

already known by a splendid work on the stained-glass windows of the cathedral of Bourges, determined upon publishing jointly a miscellaneous series of essays and disquisitions referring to mediæval history, archeology, and literature. Father Martin, an enthusiastic artist, had contributed the plates, and his *collaborateur* was to supply the letter-press. The hand of death unfortunately struck down the former of these gentlemen before he could see the result of his labours, and the task has now devolved upon Father Cahier to edit, single-handed, the large collection of materials which they had so industriously brought together.

Four volumes of the *Nouveaux Mélanges d'Archéologie* have already been issued, treating respectively of Church decorations, ivories, miniatures, enamels, &c., mystic and symbolic curiosities, libraries. Each instalment is a large and handsome quarto, profusely illustrated with woodcuts, steel engravings, and chromo-lithographs, and it would be quite impossible to name, either in England, France, or Germany, a work containing details of a more valuable description on the history of the middle ages. Father Cahier is not only a real *savant*, thoroughly familiar with his subject, and applying to the investigation of it all the resources of the most extensive learning; he likewise possesses the qualities of an admirable polemist, and we find in his style abundant specimens of that *humeur gauloise* which tells so effectively when it is kept within the bounds of propriety and decorum. Father Cahier hits hard, but always at the right place, and on the right person.

The volume treating of mediæval libraries is the latest of the collection, and here our author has enjoyed the opportunity of disposing quietly, yet effectively and conclusively, of a few propositions which are still regarded as axioms by what is called the Liberal party. We should say, in the first place, that the original sketch of the work appeared forty years ago, in M. Bonnetty's *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*, and that it was designed as a negative answer to the old question whether Christianity has been injurious to the progress of human knowledge in general, or, at any rate, to the development of certain sciences. About the years 1838 and 1839 there existed on the other side of the Channel a great enthusiasm for mediæval studies, but only from the artistic point of view. Whilst admiring the cathedrals of Chartres and of Rheims, the adepts of the *romantique* school were none the less attached to the opinions of Voltaire, and their keen appreciation of mediæval architecture did not lessen their detestation of priestly intolerance, as they called it. The lapse of nearly half a century has, of course, to a very important extent transformed the study of Church history, and a great many of our *honest* and intelligent adversaries have been led to modify their original views, if not to reject them altogether; but, on the other hand, it would be absurd to deny that the anti-Christian movement is spreading, and the epithet *clerical*, which is so freely bandied about, now serves to designate not merely Ultramontanists and Catholics, but Christians in the widest sense of the word. It is, therefore, extremely opportune to publish such treatises as the *Nouveaux Mélanges*, and we may

truly say that Father Cahier's magnificent quartos, especially the latest instalment, are to all intents and purposes an *ouvrage de circonstance*.

The volume opens, as we have already said, with an elaborate reply to M. Libri's stupid disquisition on the obscurantist character of Christianity. The next chapter, devoted to mediæval book-collections, may be considered as a further development of the same subject; churches and convents vied with each other in the foundation of libraries, and a religious establishment would have been regarded as grossly neglecting its duties if it could not have offered to its inmates ample means of acquiring knowledge of every kind. Father Cahier has brought together on this most interesting topic a number of details which we recommend to the attention of our readers. The difficulties which abbots, bishops, deans, and chapters had to overcome in procuring MSS. were very serious, and when the loan of valuable *codices* had been obtained, they had to be copied by intelligent and able scribes. The transcription of these literary treasures was made an essential part of monastic rules, and religious of both sexes deemed it an honour to be employed on such labours. The names of Hrosvita, the Abbess of Gandersheim (tenth century), and of Herrada, of Landsberg, in Alsace (twelfth century), are well known to archæologists, and the *Hortus Deliciarum* especially of the latter, destroyed by the Prussians during the siege of Strasburg in 1870, could not be the work of an ignorant woman, thoroughly tainted as she certainly was with clericalism. By a natural transition, from libraries we pass on to calligraphy, miniature-painting, and all the other subjects bearing upon the production of those MSS. which still constitute one of the most remarkable elements of European and foreign libraries. Father Cahier here draws largely from the portfolios of his late *collaborateur*, and the numerous illustrations which add so much to the beauty and interest of his volume, give us an admirable idea of mediæval art. As our author truly observes, *savants* who bring out pictorial editions of old chronicles, romances, &c., should borrow their engravings from contemporary sources, instead of having recourse to fanciful woodcuts, which are absolutely meaningless. This, let us add, is the plan adopted by the eminent publishers, Messrs. Didot, of Paris, in their splendid reprints of Joinville and Villehardouin.

The second part of the work we are now noticing is taken up by a long appendix on Spanish libraries during the middle ages. Father Tailhan, the author of this monograph, brings new and important arguments in favour of the wholesome influence of the mediæval clergy on literary and scientific culture; he shows in the most conclusive manner that the Visigothic priesthood, far from ruining the Hispano-Romish Church, as Don A. de Los Rios pretends, added much to its efficiency, and that the wonderful development of civilisation which Spain enjoyed under the sway of the Gothic monarchs of Toledo was entirely the result of what M. Libri, M. Letronne, and their disciples, are pleased to designate as fanaticism and ignorance. Let us hope that publications such as the *Nouveaux Mélanges* will help to clear away a few prejudices, and to place in its true light the character of the Church during the middle ages.

Etude sur le Travail. Par S. MONY, Ancien Député. 8vo. (Paris: L. Hachette et Cie.)

M. MONY's volume is the best work that has been published since M. Bastiat's *Harmonies Economiques* on the important question of capital and labour. The distinctive feature which recommends it specially to the attention of all serious and impartial readers is its essentially practical character, and it is a great relief to find at last facts and observations taken as the substratum of an inquiry which by most politicians and economists has been hitherto conducted from the *à priori* point of view.

The following quotation will serve to illustrate the spirit of M. Mony's excellent volume. It seems that the author, before sending it to the press, had submitted it to the judgment of a few friends; they all encouraged him to go on, but one did so *avec des réserves*, and objected to the great end, as he thought, undue share allotted to the influence of Christianity. M. Mony thus answers his critic:—

'To treat a social question otherwise than in a Christian spirit is to do as futile a work as if we treated it irrespective of human nature. We are told that Christianity does not enjoy, just now, the favour of the people; but of what people do our adversaries speak, and who has the right to put himself forward as the interpreter and mouthpiece of the people? Let us admit that there exists at present a transitory disturbance, it would still be necessary to ascertain how far down the revolutionary effervescence against religion has penetrated. Has that fact been properly determined? But supposing even that the anti-religious idea enjoys the power claimed on its behalf, ought we then, for the purpose of propitiating it, to cast a veil over the Christian spirit in a work of which Christianity is the foundation? If I have assigned to religion the first place in this volume, it is because that place is its due; as I meant, in the introductory chapters of my *Etude*, to discuss the generating principles of human society, I could not but show, at the very outset, the imperishable foundation on which these principles rest, and that foundation is Christianity.'

After so clear and so frank a profession of faith, we can only add that M. Mony has carefully avoided falling into the fault of which he accuses his opponents, namely, that of adopting the *à priori* line, and of theorising, as is the wont of the Rousseau school of politicians. He is a man who speaks with the more authority on the respective claims of capital and labour, because he has himself done long and good service in the army of the *travailleurs*; he knows full well that if we want to address with some tangible result, not a small coterie of thinkers, but an audience of practical men, we must appeal to logic, to nature, to experience, and to common sense; the use of any other means of persuasion would be perfectly and absolutely futile.

M. Mony does not entertain the slightest illusion respecting the number of those who are likely to take up his book. The so-called champions of free thought are, as a matter of fact, so blindly enslaved by the vapid declamations of stump orators, that the title of the first chapter will prejudice them against it, and if any of the

radical newspapers denounce it as tainted by clericalism, the freest thinkers will condemn it unread. Nothing daunted, our author has determined upon making an appeal to the good sense of the minority, and we have no doubt that the endeavour will be crowned with success.

The question of capital and labour gives rise to a number of considerations more or less important, which all deserve to be carefully discussed, and which M. Mony has examined in their various details. The most noteworthy chapters are those referring to *salaries*, to the *budget of the working-classes*, and to the *perturbations of salaries*; here it was more than ever essential to reason exclusively from the study of facts, because certain political economists have attempted to determine salaries on merely theoretical grounds, without taking into consideration the data of experience.

Whatever views we may entertain on the relations between employers and employed, capitalists and workmen, it is an undisputed fact that the healthful solutions of economic problems depend, to a very great extent, on the conditions of order and of stability in political society; hence M. Mony's concluding chapter, entitled *Considérations Politiques*: it is one of the best in the volume. Montesquieu had said, a century ago, that Christianity required for all communities the best social and political laws; and it is quite evident that there is no security possible for labour if these laws do not exist. Our author lays down the proposition that the French civil laws are the best that can be devised, and he blames his fellow-citizens for making the very perfection of these laws an excuse for the readiness with which they run into political adventures. The example of England, so often quoted by French philosophers since the days of Montesquieu, is once more adduced here, and given as a proof that the fundamental principle of an *entente cordiale* between order and liberty is not a paradox; our neighbours, however, although they possess the germs of a good political legislation, have not yet gone further in that direction. The only obstacle they had to overcome, half a century ago, was that presented by centralisation—the exaggeration of authority; they have now borrowed from the arsenal of the National Convention the wild scheme of universal suffrage—the exaggeration of liberty; and thus they are under the sway of two institutions, equally incompatible with a temperate monarchy and a temperate republic. M. Mony has no difficulty in demonstrating that universal suffrage, by bringing up to the surface the scum of society, and by giving exactly the same weight to idleness and industry, is in flagrant contradiction with the most elementary axioms, not only of political economy, but of Christianity; and that, accordingly, those who take it as the substratum of government are building on the sand, perpetuating discords, and sanctioning the most objectionable utopias of the Revolution.

Life of John Eadie, D.D., LL.D. By JAMES BROWNE, D.D., Author of *The Life of a Scottish Probationer*. London : Macmillan and Co.

'THE uneventful life,' says the author of this memoir, 'of a pastor and scholar does not generally furnish much material for biography. In Dr. Eadie's case there is a more than usual lack of incident. He never removed from the city where he began his ministry, and he did not connect his name with the controversies of the time. He kept no journal, and he seldom wrote a letter which extended beyond the limits of a hurried business note. It was nevertheless believed by those who knew him best, that if the story of his quiet laborious life could be simply told, the record would be neither uninteresting nor unprofitable.'

The foregoing extract will explain with preciseness what is and what is not to be looked for in this brief narrative. The reader is not to expect an *aperçu* of the great movements ecclesiastical or political which fell during Dr. Eadie's time, for he took but little part in them, and, as a rule, exerted no influence whatever in shaping or directing them in any way. Nor must the reader look to be compensated for this paucity of connexion with the external world by any richness of character or complexity of mental history in the subject. It is the life of a scholar ; of one whose strongest passion was the impulse to study. Thus it was essentially a quiet and solitary life, yet not without its absorbing interests and its successes, mostly of a literary kind. Neither the one nor the other is very fully expressed here. Only Dr. Eadie himself could have put them into words, and he, we have seen, was so self-contained a man, and so habitually taciturn, that the knowledge of his inner life has passed away with him.

He was born of parents in poor circumstances, and pushed his way not without considerable effort and self-denial, to the ranks of the ministry of the denomination of United Presbyterians. He never seems to have achieved in his ministerial profession more than a *succès d'estime*, but as time went on, his zeal, learning, and ability in his own special department of the exegesis of Scripture, worked their way to the respect of an increasing number of hearers and readers. During his best years, his biographer relates, 'he wrought simultaneously in three distinct spheres of labour,' viz., his pastorate, his various literary undertakings, and the Professorship of Biblical Literature in the theological institution with which the leaders of his denomination, wise unquestionably in their generation, had supplemented the classes of the university course they required their students to attend. His doings in the first and last of these capacities, however, must be considered interesting chiefly to his townsmen and co-religionists, nor do they in fact present any marked features, beyond the earnestness and thoroughness, the unflagging industry with which he was wont to carry out whatever his hand found to do. But the chapter of his life which describes his literary labours will probably attract the attention of a wider circle of readers than any other in the book. As a commentator he has many merits, among which patience and fairness are not the least conspicuous. To his ability as a compiler the various

biblical and ecclesiastical Encyclopædias which bear his name, though these are of very various merit, yet bear abundant witness. His last work, however, on *The English Bible*, is probably his best, as it was the monument of his life-long labours in his own special line of study.

A copy of this work was presented by him to each of his colleagues in the (New Testament) Revision Company, in April, 1876; and it was singular that the work proved a parting gift, for he never attended again. Dr. Eadie passed away in June, 1876.

The following description of one of his rare and infrequent seasons of recreation and travel, may serve as a good specimen of the memoir:—

‘Our destination was St. Mary’s Loch, and, at the far end of it, the rather illegitimate, but altogether comfortable hostelry of the famous Tibby Shiels. “A bit cosie bield is Tibby’s,” as the shepherd says in one of the *Noctes*; and such, at all events, we found it. Tibby took to “the Purfessor” all at once, something, I suppose, in his bigness, and simplicity, and heartiness reminding her of that other “Purfessor” whom, in her earlier days, she had so often entertained. Our Professor was a special care to Tibby, whether for the moment the question was about the due airing of his nether garments, drenched by a mountain shower, or the arrangements necessary for his dinner, or the measures to be taken for summoning the neighbouring shepherds to hear his sermon on the Sunday afternoon. The sermon was a great event in the district. How it got so well advertised in so short a space we never could quite understand; but, certainly, when the hour came, the hills and the dales seemed to have sent their last man to the little chapel, all aware of the name and fame of the expected preacher. There they were, shaggily but decently homespun in aspect and attire, “maud” on shoulder and crook in hand, with weather-beaten but sagacious faces; and the “dowgs” seemed as numerous as their masters, and were equally well-behaved. When Eadie lounged in through the little side door, and heaved himself into the pulpit, and brushing the elf-locks from his brow, looked round him, with his piercing half-humorous glance, as he proceeded to give out the psalm, the impression produced upon his audience was evidently mingled, half expectant, half doubtful. He was not exactly clerical looking, and his manner was anything but conventional; but there was a homely dignity about him, and indisputable weight, and soon both gravity and unction began to show themselves. When he announced his text, “How much, then, is a man better than a sheep?” perplexity struggled with a wondering interest in the upturned faces which dared not smile. Was the speaker quizzing them, or needlessly coming down to them? or would he justify after all his singular choice of a subject, and give them a sober but fresh and original discourse. They were not held long in suspense’—(p. 210).

Life of Sir Titus Salt, Bart. By R. BALGARNIE. (Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 319.)

IN spite of the singularly ungainly and infelicitous manner in which this *Life* is written, it cannot help carrying considerable interest with it, for the subject was one of those real, substantial people whose strength is intrinsic. But, feeling how much there is we should really like to know about Titus Salt, the great Yorkshire manufacturer, it is provoking to be put off with a volume which seems to have been put together by means of a free use of scissors and paste, from local

journals and newspapers; and when we look for traits of character and real information, we encounter details of public dinners—the weight of meat and pounds of pudding set forth. Titus Salt was a Nonconformist, and the writer of his *Life* is a Nonconformist minister, whose aim seems to be indiscriminate glorification of the man, and puffery of the cause—the result being a feeble, unreadable book, while the attempts at imaginary and ‘appropriate’ language are often ludicrous, sometimes profane. Titus Salt was born 1803, and his biographer seems to think it must be eminently satisfactory to those ‘who have been taught to lay much stress on the rite of Baptism,’ to know that he was *twice* baptized! Of his education in business we hear little—his taking up alpaca wool and introducing it into the trade is told but tamely—and the history of Saltaire is, as we have said, chiefly quoted from local newspapers. One anecdote is worthy quotation:—‘On entering his works one day, Salt discovered that some of the yarn had been spoilt in the spinning process. He inquired who had done the mischief.’ A workman stepped forward and said, ‘It is of no use, sir, accusing anybody else; I am the man who did it.’ Of course he expected nothing but summary dismissal for his negligence, and anxiously waited the verdict. ‘What do you mean to do!’ asked Mr. Salt. ‘Do better, sir,’ was the reply. ‘Then,’ said his master with a smile, ‘go and do it’—(p. 149).

Titus Salt was not a man of literary tastes himself. Being asked one day what books he had been reading, his answer was ‘Alpaca.’ Nevertheless we should have liked a little more literary capacity to have been exercised in what might have been made a readable book of half the size, weeded of its newspaper extracts and conventionalities.

Sir Titus Salt died Christmas, 1876, surrounded by affection and respect well earned, and a lesson, not to be despised, of steadfast industry and upright honesty may assuredly be learned even from these clumsily ordered pages.

The Life of George Combe, Author of The Constitution of Man. By CHARLES GIBBON. Two volumes. (Macmillan and Co.)

THE work before us is of composite authorship. Mr. Combe left behind him an unfinished autobiography, describing in a wonderfully vivid manner the painful yet instructive experiences of his childhood and youth, which has formed the germ of the present memoir; of the rest, his own innumerable and interminable letters form, we should think, quite one-half; and the remainder, though well executed as a piece of literary work, is of decidedly inferior interest. It will take, we fear, an enthusiastic phrenologist to read these volumes, or, at all events, to find them interesting. Such people are still to be found, though not so frequently as formerly. The memoir takes us back to those early times when phrenology, if it had more violent opponents than any it finds now, had also far more earnest and strenuous defenders. Now it is only one among the ologies, and a somewhat antiquated one, about which there is little charm of novelty, and which interests no one to the extent of inducing him to give up his life to its propagation. Now, this is

exactly what Combe did. He devoted his time, his money, his labour, to diffuse it in England, America, and on the continent. For religion, in the usual sense, he never seems to have cared very much, and he preached phrenology as a religion. We do not think the record of his efforts in that direction very interesting. The real interest of the book lies in those painful trials of his early life which caused him to become an educational and sanitary reformer, and this interest is sufficiently great to cause the book to be worth reading and to be read.

The Royal Hospital and Collegiate Church of Saint Katherine near the Tower in its Relation to the East of London. By FREDERICK SIMCOX LEA, M.A., Rector of Tedstone Delamere. With Preface by the Lord Bishop of LONDON, the Duke of WESTMINSTER, and others. (London : Longmans.)

IN this seasonable volume Mr. F. S. Lea has given a sketch of great, and to the inhabitants of the metropolis, at all events, of general, interest. We say seasonable, for it has no doubt been issued advisedly at this time, when it is understood that a new scheme for the application of the (greatly increased) funds of this Foundation is being prepared, and in order at once to enlighten and to direct public opinion. The whole precinct or parish of S. Katherine, we need hardly remind our readers, was purchased in 1825 in order to construct the S. Katherine's Docks, and now lies under water. The remainder of the East End of London, however, not unnaturally conceives that it has a claim to participate in the benefits of the Foundation, of which it has been, during the last half century, wholly deprived ; and this view has found eloquent expression in the Preface to the present work, which is signed by persons of such importance as the Duke of Westminster, Earl Nelson, and the Bishop of London and other influential clergymen and laymen. To the expression of this opinion these gentlemen, however, confine themselves. They do not attempt to prescribe the mode in which this 'share in benefits' should be conferred, nor the shape which it should assume. It appeared to be thought some time ago that the mastership of S. Katherine's might furnish East London with a suffragan bishop. But it was probably surmised that the East Enders might 'look the gift horse in the mouth,' and that there were some things they needed even more than a bishop. Yet, when it is pointed out that to spend it in schools, as some have proposed, is simply to come to the aid of the rates, and that some weighty objection lies against every conceivable way of disposing of the funds, the observer will find it hard to say which would be preferable. The fact is, all this perplexity arises from the demolition wholesale of the church and the entire home and machinery of the hospital. The destruction of churches seldom brings a blessing, nor has this particular demolition done so. Had it been yet standing in its old place the question of its reform would have been a simple one. The sphere of its beneficent influence would, or might, have been widened with its increasing wealth ; and the thing would have been done.

We do not know that the old Collegiate Church of S. Katherine which was pulled down, as we have said, in 1825, was at all worth keeping on archæological or architectural grounds; but really the authorities in the matter might do a worse thing than rebuild it in all its stateliness, and give the 'Brothers' 30,000 or 40,000 of the uncared for masses to look after, and gather their 'Bedesmen' and 'Bedeswomen' out of. Not that we suppose that this is likely to be done.

We must not omit to say that Mr. Lea has traced with great clearness and sufficient minuteness the eventful history of the Foundation. It may be divided into three periods. 1st. From 1148 to 1545, when it was a dignified Collegiate and Ecclesiastical Foundation of priests and choirmen, bound to worship daily in their own stately church, and supporting pensioners of both sexes, who were under a similar obligation. Then (2nd) came the period of storm and spoliation which swept over S. Katherine's as it did over other pious foundations in this land, involving them all in a common wreck; and (3rd) the secular period. The institution emerged from the spoliation it underwent with the whole of its distinctive character shorn away, and became in practice a secular sinecure, retaining the marks of what it was, yet wholly without tangible purpose or *raison d'être*, further than to provide a piece of Court patronage. To what a degree it had withered and dwarfed under the disastrous influences of idleness and uselessness may be seen from the ease with which it was uprooted in 1825. Had it been a living and vigorous tree it would not have been torn up so easily; but since it was barren and useless it was as well in Regent's Park as anywhere else. Now, by Her Majesty's appointment of a clergyman as Head of the Chapter, there is hope of its becoming a reality, and making for itself an appreciable sphere of influence once more. We are sure Mr. Lea's volume will be welcome to all who wish well to the Foundation.

Samuel Johnson. By LESLIE STEPHEN. (Macmillan and Co.)

Walter Scott. By R. H. HUTTON. (Macmillan and Co.)

Gibbon. By J. C. MORISON. (Macmillan and Co.)

THESE are all that we have seen of a series (projected by Messrs. Macmillan) of short books of English men of letters, and if the rest be equally well executed with those before us, the series will be a great success. We heartily commend these vivid and interesting sketches to all our readers. For fulness and accuracy of information and for soundness of criticism they are equally commendable.

Our Church and Our Country. By the Rev. G. VENABLES. (Wells Gardner, London.)

THIS is a sketch of the history of the Church of England down to the current year, intended for and dedicated to the working men of England. We only wish that every layman, working man or other, could be compelled to make himself acquainted with its admirable summary of the facts which every churchman ought to know. The fact that it is now in its *fifth* edition shows that it has been appreciated, and will no doubt encourage the Clergy to introduce it largely into their parochial libraries, especially in towns.

VOL. VII.—NO. XIII.

S

The Fathers for English Readers. (S.P.C.K.)

FOUR volumes of this series are now before us. They deal with (1) The Apostolic Fathers; (2) The Apologists; (3) S. Jerome; (4) S. Augustine. They are all by different but very competent hands, and give full and readable accounts of the writers with whom they deal, their works, and likewise of the circumstances of the times in which they lived. For the vast majority of persons the best introduction to history is through biography; and we can heartily commend this attempt to popularise a real and living acquaintance with the history of the early Church.

An Elder Sister: A Short Sketch of Anne Mackenzie and Her Brother, the Missionary Bishop. By FRANCES AWDRY. (Bemrose, London.)

A MOST vivid account of Bishop Mackenzie's short but remarkable career, and of the part borne in it by the elder sister, who, in her way, deserves to be remembered to the full as much as her brother. It is a story of much trial and endurance, and makes one feel that, however largely luxury and indifference may abound, still the present age is not without its witnesses for better things. We hope that the book may be widely read, and that it may do its part in keeping up the tone of true self-devotion in the religion of our times.

St. Francis of Sales, of the Love of God. (Rivingtons, London.)

WE lose no time in making known to our readers this very good translation of a very lovely and charming book. It forms one of Messrs. Rivingtons' Library of Scriptural Works for English Catholics, and is beautifully printed.

The Guide of Life. A Manual of Prayers for Women. By C. E. SKINNER. (Rivingtons.)

CLERGYMEN will be glad to know of this little manual as one which they may most safely put into the hands of intelligent women of the better class of those who have to work for their living. It is very complete in its scope, and it is not only a manual of devotions, but is really what it is entitled 'a guide of life,' and is evidently the work of one who thoroughly understands the needs and the trials of the important class for which it is intended.

Mr. F. Atkinson's Resurrection and other Poems. (Skeffington and Son.)

A VOLUME of graceful, devotional, and meditative poetry which in this prosaic and busy age demands a respectful and grateful acknowledgment.

Origen the Preacher; being Fifty Short Sermon Notes founded upon Select Passages from his Writings. By JOHN M. ASHLEY, B.C.L., Vicar of Fewston. London: J. F. Hayes.

VERSIONS of a version are these scraps of homiletic matter which

Mr. Ashley has here given to his readers; for most of Origen's Homilies exist only in the Latin versions of Ruffinus, Jerome, and other unknown translators; and the Greek originals have perished. If there remains any brilliancy in the thoughts, any elegance in the metaphors, here presented to us, after having thus been twice through the ordeal of translation, it is no small testimony to the splendour and insight of the writer's genius; and this they unquestionably do retain. For these fragments of sermons we can commend Mr. Ashley's book. The biographical notice prefixed seems to us too brief and general to call for serious criticism.

Pamphlets, &c. Of recent Pamphlets we would specially mention the BISHOP OF WINCHESTER's valuable and well-considered *Charge* to his Cathedral Chapter and his Diocese; *Archdeacon Hessey's Charge*, which sums up all the arguments for a Diocesan Conference; the BISHOP OF LINCOLN's *Letter to Sir G. Prevost on Sisterhoods and Vows*, in which the history of the subject is carefully considered; MR. T. T. CARTER's *Present Movement, a true Phase of Anglo-Catholic Church Principles*, wherein, in the form of a letter to the Primate, the author certainly has issued a most powerful defence of his position; as also the same writer's *Are Vows of Celibacy in Early Life inconsistent with the Word of God?* written in reference to the above-named letter of the Bishop of Lincoln. In this pamphlet Mr. Carter shows that dedication to a life of celibacy was one thing and enrolment as a 'Church widow' quite another: that both were clearly recognized in Scripture and the primitive Church, and that such dedication was then held to be binding. MR. E. F. WILLIS' *Sacri-ficial Aspect of the Eucharist*—clear, well-arranged and to all candid minds convincing; a very interesting *Sermon* of DEAN SCOTT's (of Rochester) on the occasion of the Eight Hundredth Anniversary of the Foundation of Bishop Gundulph's Hospital; and lastly, we name as a pamphlet to be kept among the records of the year, *The Episcopal Letter and Reports of Committees*, published (Cassell and Co.) under the authority of the members of the Pan-Anglican Conference.

ON THE ALTERATION OF A LINE IN THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

To the Editor of THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

SIR,—Absence from England, and other circumstances, prevented my seeing or hearing of the last number of the *Church Quarterly* till to-day, and I write at once, hoping to be yet in time for this month's issue, a word in reply to Dr. Pusey's remark (p. 542) to the effect that, 'after all I cannot understand to what end all this fuss made by Professor Burrows and Dean Burgon, if they hold at all by the early Church or the Council of Nice.' As far as I am concerned, I have nothing to do with the questions arising out of the

alteration of the line in the *Christian Year*, however unfortunate and misleading I may think it. If the Dean of Chichester sees Dr. Pusey's letter, and thinks himself called upon to deal with it, no doubt he will do so. All that I said in *The Times* was that the subscriptions to Keble College stopped about the time of that alteration.

Whatever 'fuss' I have been guilty of making was in connection with my caution against 'Keble-worship,' founded upon the difference of tone and teaching traceable in the earlier and later periods of that remarkable man's life. This Dr. Pusey called in the *Guardian* setting up an 'imaginary Keble.' I am spared the necessity of enlarging on this point by the recorded words of Mr. Keble himself, to be found in Sir John Coleridge's 'Life,' p. 282, of the first edition; and the quotation of these will, I hope, absolve me from the charge of making a 'fuss.'

Sir John, in 1845, had written to his friend on the subject of the *Lyra Innocentium*, remarking on the 'difference of tone' between it and the *Christian Year*, to which Mr. Keble writes as follows :—

'When I wrote that [the *Christian Year*] I did not understand (to mention no more points) either the doctrine of Repentance, or that of the Holy Eucharist, as held, e.g., by Bishop Ken, nor that of Justification, and such points as those must surely make a great difference.'

I will venture to ask whether it is possible to possess more absolutely complete testimony than this to the difference between the 'earlier and later John Keble,' and, still further, whether those who, delighting in the *Christian Year*, yet believe that the subsequent 'understanding' of the doctrines mentioned was a retrograde, instead of an 'advanced' movement, are not justified in the protests they have made against being called upon to swallow down, on the strength of the well-deserved reputation Keble acquired from his one great work, all that he subsequently wrote? Your readers will judge.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

MONTAGU BURROWS.

Oxford : October 3, 1878.

[*This Correspondence is now absolutely closed.—Ed. C. Q. R.*]

CORRECTION.

We have been requested by the Marchese Vitelleschi to state that it was he, and not the Cardinal Vitelleschi, as stated in our last Number, who wrote under the nom de plume of Pomponio Leto. He likewise requests us to add that the Cardinal was not aware of the existence of the book until some time after its publication, and communicated no materials for it.